DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 571 SP 017 876

TITLE	A Study of Reciprocity for Certifying Teachers in Georgia. Issues for Education Series.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Professional Standards Commission, Atlanta.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	123p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Georgia Professional Standards Commission, Suite 605, 1645 Tullie Circle, NE, Atlanta, GA 30329 (Single copy available to appropriate educational officials while supply lasts).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; *Accrediting Agencies; Faculty Mobility; Graduation Requirements; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; *Institutional Evaluation; State Legislation; *State Licensing Boards; State Standards; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; Teacher Transfer
IDENTIFIERS	*Georgia; *Reciprocity

ABSTRACT

This monograph is a compilation of information gathered and studied by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission in considering whether to recommend reciprocity in certification for out-of-state teachers. An examination was made of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). It was felt that, while NCATE and NASDTEC did not imply reciprocity, the Interstate Certification Project (ICP) did. Consideration was given to the opinions of Georgia school personnel. Comparisons were made of NCATE and NASDTEC standards and certification requirements of non-ICP states and ICP states. Following deliberations, it was recommended to the State Board of Education that legislation be initiated so that Georgia can join the ICP. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200571

A STUDY OF RECIPROCITY FOR CERTIFYING TEACHERS IN GEORGIA

Issues for Education Series

Georgia
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
Suite 105
1645 Tullie Circle, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30329

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard C. Owens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SP 017876

ABOUT THE COMMISSION

The Professional Standards Commission was created by the General Assembly in March, 1976, to make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding standards for "the preparation, certification, and professional growth of those persons who teach or perform educational duties in the school systems or schools" of Georgia.

The Professional Standards Commission may recommend to the State Board of Education standards for:

- Certification of educational personnel to practice in the public schools of Georgia;
- Pre-service preparation of personnel;
- Accreditation of teacher education programs;
- Certification through in-service training (staff development);
- Objective measurement and evaluation of teaching competence as a basis of teacher certification;
- Examination of subject matter for certifying educational personnel;
- Committees in teacher education institutions to screen teacher candidates on the basis of academic, personal, and emotional fitness for the profession.

The Commission operates under a mandate from the Georgia Legislature in accordance with the "Georgia Professional Standards Act," approved March 25, 1976, as amended by an Act approved March 24, 1977, as amended by an Act approved April 16, 1979.

The Commission is composed of carefully screened professionals representing all levels of instruction from kindergarten through college, including teachers and administrators. It also includes representatives from the State Department of Education and from local school boards. The Governor appoints Georgia residents from nominees submitted by professional educator organizations. The State Superintendent of Schools appoints the representative from the Georgia Department of Education.

Service on the Commission is voluntary. Members serve without compensation. Reimbursement is made for travel, lodging, and meals directly related to Commission business. Teachers are provided released time for Commission business.

The Professional Standards Commission serves a unique function for education in Georgia as it provides a continuing broad-based examination of the quality of educational personnel at both the preparatory and performance level, including not only beginning teachers but also experienced teachers, supervisors, and administrators. This role is essential to the continuous updating of professional qualifications and hence improvement of leadership and classroom instruction at all levels in Georgia schools.

A STUDY OF RECIPROCITY

FOR CERTIFYING TEACHERS IN GEORGIA

Issues for Education Series

Richard C. Owens
Chairman

Gwendolyn Mundy
Vice Chairman

Suzann R. Harrison
Administrative Assistant

Georgia
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
Suite 105
1645 Tullie Circle
Atlanta, GA 30329

Georgia

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION PUBLICATIONS

Issues for Education Series Monographs

A Study of Reciprocity for Certifying Teachers in Georgia

Teacher Satisfaction in Georgia and the Nation: Status and Trends
Teacher Burnout: Causes and Possible Cures

Off Campus/External Degree Education in Georgia: A Status Report

Administrator Evaluation: A Look at Georgia and the Nation

Commission Working Papers

Teacher Preparation, Certification, Staff Development in Georgia in the 1980s

Bibliography and Literature Review of Professional Preparation and Practice in Georgia From 1968 Through 1979

A Proposed Design for a Professional Programs Evaluation Center

Professional Programs Evaluation Project Progress Report: 1978-79

Unpublished Commission Studies/Reports

"Staff Development in the Public Schools of Georgia"

"Status Study of Admissions to and Retention in Teacher Education in Thirty-two Georgia Institutions"

"Analysis of Evaluation Committees for Teacher Education Programs in Georgia"

"Professional Growth of Life Certificated Teachers in the Public Schools of Georgia"

"The Status of Substitute Teaching in Georgia"

"Vocational Teaching (V) Certificates"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN 1

INTRODUCTION 2

COMMISSION RECIPROCITY RECOMMENDATION 6

HOW ARE OUT-OF-STATE APPLICANTS TREATED UNDER CURRENT PROCEDURES? 7

OVERVIEW--NCATE, NASDTEC, ICP 11

History of NCATE 25

History of NASDTEC 28

History of Interstate Certification Project 29

THE OPINIONS OF GEORGIA SCHOOL PERSONNEL ON RECIPROCITY 31

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND NASDTEC STANDARDS 35

ANALYSIS OF NASDTEC STANDARDS, AS COMPARED TO THE GEORGIA STANDARDS FOR APPROVING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS 43

COMPARISON OF GEORGIA AND NASDTEC STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TEACHING FIELDS (Undergraduate Levels) 49

GEORGIA CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTED FIELDS 61

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS (ICP States) 63

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS (Non-ICP States) 69

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS IN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES FOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS (ICP States) 73

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS IN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES FOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS (Non-ICP States) 78

CONCLUSION 83

APPENDICES

Appendix A--Questionnaire on State Practices in Certifying Out-of-State Teachers 91

Appendix B--Survey on Certification of Out-of-State Teacher Applicants (Teacher) 93

Appendix C--Survey on Certification of Out-of-State Teacher Applicants (Superintendent and Principal) 94

FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

The Georgia Professional Standards Commission is pleased to share "A Study of Reciprocity for Certifying Teachers in Georgia" with concerned educators and lay citizens.

This Commission monograph is a compilation of information gathered and studied by the Commission in considering whether to recommend reciprocity in certification to the State Board of Education. After study and deliberation, the recommendation (page 6) to the State Board of Education was adopted by the full Commission on January 16, 1981.

Portions of this monograph, especially but not exclusively "Comparison, Georgia and Other States' Certification Requirements for Selected Fields" (pp. 61 ff.), will perhaps be of interest--and possibly assistance--to a wide audience.

The Commission shall be pleased to receive comments on ideas in this paper and/or comments or suggestions regarding standards for teacher preparation, certification and staff development in the State.

The Commission appreciates the assistance and cooperation of many persons who contributed information to and encouragement for this project: the State Department of Education, other Georgia educators, teacher certification and licensure officers across the United States, and especially the diligent and skilled research work of Dr. Eva C. Galambos, Research Associate, Southern Regional Education Board.

This monograph is another Commission effort in fulfilling its legislated mandate and the Commission pledge to contribute to a unified, cooperative effort to increase educational quality and opportunity in Georgia.

Richard C. Owens
Chairman

INTRODUCTION

This report analyzes the possibility of instituting some form of reciprocity for out-of-state applicants who seek certification to teach in Georgia.

Three possibilities were examined--National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) and the Interstate Certification Project (ICP). NCATE and NASDTEC do not really imply reciprocity. There is nothing inherent in these two organizations and the services they provide to insure that if Georgia expedites certification of applicants completing programs that were approved by NCATE or by states using NASDTEC Standards the same privilege would then be extended to Georgia applicants. Less than one-third of the states use NCATE or NASDTEC to materially expedite certification of their out-of-state applicants.

The ICP arrangement is the only one that truly provides for reciprocity. Important features of the ICP system are listed below.

1. ICP does not require the use of a specific set of standards for state program approval of teacher education programs. Each state may use its own set of standards, but must review programs at least once every 5 years. However, of the 33 states that are parties to ICP contracts covering teachers, 21 states plus the District of Columbia use the NASDTEC Standards for evaluating their teacher education programs.
2. ICP is implemented by a state through passage of enabling legislation which has the effect of superseding any previous legislation that may have required specific courses for the certification of teachers.

3. A state that joins ICP may sign a reciprocity agreement with as many other states that belong to the system as it wishes. It may choose to sign only with those states that have certification requirements or program approval standards that are close to its own.

4. ICP does not require that reciprocity must be given to all school personnel. Separate contracts may be signed for teachers, support personnel, administrators, and vocational education personnel. The most commonly used contract pertains only to teachers.

5. If a reciprocity agreement is signed between any two states, the receiving state must certify applicants who have either completed an approved program in the originating state, or who have completed three years of successful teaching and hold a certificate from the originating state.

6. The receiving state may still require that applicants entitled to reciprocity pass teacher certification tests. Thus the Georgia Criterion Referenced Tests would still have to be taken and passed by out-of-state applicants. Also the new policy of requiring three years of performance evaluation before a renewable certificate is issued would still hold.

7. States that are parties to ICP may not require applicants to take additional courses to qualify for the initial standards certificate in the field for which their program qualified them or for the field in which they already hold a certificate. Since adoption of enabling legislation to put ICP into place would be subsequent to HB 671, applicants from ICP states would not have to take the special education course required by that bill.

8. Receiving states do not have any obligation to issue a certificate for a field that is broader than the field for which the applicant was certified by the originating state, or for which the approved program prepared that applicant. This means that Georgia would not have to issue a certificate for the broad field of general science, for example, if the applicant's preparation or certificate is for the specific field of chemistry. Also the receiving state may still require advanced degrees for any given field if its certification for in-state applicants requires such advanced degrees.

A two-week sample of all out-of-state certificate applicants on which actions were taken was used to determine the effects of reciprocity. This study netted a total of 188 actions on out-of-state applicants, with all but three of these receiving some type of certificate, including provisional ones. Had Georgia been a party to ICP, 62% of these actions would have been expedited with no necessity to check detailed course credits on transcripts. Of the total that would have been expedited, three-fourths originated from programs in the ICP states of Alabama, Florida, and North Carolina.

Of the 117 out-of-state applicants from ICP states, 37 received evaluations by the Certification Unit that indicate further courses must be taken to qualify for standard professional certificates. If ICP had been in effect, no such additional coursework could have been required. At the same time, none of the three individuals who were ineligible for any type of certificate in Georgia would have been issued a certificate if ICP had been in effect.

Since joining ICP does not eliminate the requirements for CRT or performance evaluation, the only major requirement that would be sacrificed

would be the one to take additional courses such as the reading course, the special education course, or some required content course that the curriculum of another state's approved program did not include.

Teachers, principals and superintendents in Georgia were surveyed to determine their opinions on a possible move toward reciprocity. The following major findings resulted from this survey:

1. 78 and 69 percent of the superintendents and principals, respectively, responded that sacrificing the evaluation of transcripts for out-of-state applicants, and therefore of some courses that may not have been taken, would not have any appreciable effect on the quality of out-of-state teachers employed. The question on this item was qualified with the proviso that the CRT and performance evaluation would still apply.
2. Approximately two-thirds of the principals and superintendents did not feel that the requirements for additional courses were important factors in determining the availability of out-of-state applicants to teach in Georgia.
3. Sixty percent of the superintendents and 46 percent of the principals indicated that it has become increasingly difficult to fill teaching positions during the last two years, and that everything possible should be done to expedite the certification process for out-of-state applicants. Special education, math and science were listed, in that order, as the fields in which the greatest teaching manpower problems exist.

4. Sixty percent of the teachers have no objection to the fact that some out-of-state teachers under a reciprocity system might not have to take all the same courses they were required to take. This question again included the proviso that all would be treated equally concerning CRT and performance evaluation.
5. Half of the teachers favor a move to expedite certification of out-of-state applicants only if such a move were reciprocal in nature. An additional one-third favor loosening the certification requirements for out-of-state applicants even if no reciprocity is involved. The remainder do not see a need for a change in how out-of-state applicants are handled.

Information for this study and report was compiled for the Commission by Dr. Eva C. Galambos, Research Associate, Southern Regional Education Board. Most of the information was compiled, and surveys conducted, during late summer and early fall 1980.

COMMISSION RECIPROCITY RECOMMENDATION

Following study and deliberation, the full Commission, on January 16, 1981, adopted the following recommendation:

The Professional Standards Commission recommends to the State Board of Education that legislation be initiated whereby Georgia can join the Interstate Certification Project.

HOW ARE OUT-OF-STATE APPLICANTS TREATED UNDER CURRENT PROCEDURES?

A two-week sample of out-of-state applicants to the Georgia State Certification Unit was studied. All completed evaluations of applicants (certificates, certificates conditional on certain requirements, and denials) involving out-of-state applicants were analyzed according to an evaluation form. This analysis was done by the certification evaluators of the Georgia State Certification Unit. (Confidentiality considerations precluded analysis of the applicants by an outsider.) No actions are included that involve requests for additional information when a final evaluation was not yet completed.

This analysis yielded 188 evaluations included in this summary.

	Number	Percent	
	53	28%	were issued professional certificates
	69	37%	qualify for certificates of some kind, but must take the CRT*
Require Additional Courses	41	22%	qualify for certificates of some kind, but must take the CRT and also take the required HB 671** exceptional children course
Require Additional Courses	10	5%	qualify for certificates of some kind, but must take the required HB 671 exceptional children course
Require Additional Courses	12	6%	qualify for certificates of some kind, but must meet some other requirement, usually involving additional course work
	3	2%	were denied because they did not meet requirements at all

The 37 percent that qualified for certificates of some kind, but must take the CRT are recent graduates, for whom the CRT is mandatory. They have not had previous teaching experience and have not held certificates in other states. The CRT is mandated for persons completing programs after 9-1-1978.

* Criterion Referenced Test
**House Bill 671 which mandates a special education course for each teacher.

The 22 percent who qualify for certificates of some kind, but must take the CRT and also take a course in exceptional children are also fairly recent graduates, since the HB 671 requirement applies to persons graduating after 7-1-1976. Only two of this group had taught before.

The 5 percent who qualify for certificates of some kind, but must take the HB 671 required course in exceptional children includes six individuals who have taught before.

The 6 percent who are eligible for some type of certificate (often a provisional certificate, rather than a professional one, thus earning somewhat less than the other teachers) but who must fulfill certain other requirements includes persons who must meet the recency of study requirement, or the reading course requirement (in force as of 9-1-1976) or who are short in content hour requirements.

NCATE Approvals

Of the 188 individuals in the analysis, 70 percent were from NCATE programs. This would indicate that if the NCATE program criteria were used to automatically guarantee a certificate, over two-thirds of the out-of-state applicants would not have to be analyzed. There is one problem in implementing such a policy. By waiving analysis of the credentials to persons who completed NCATE programs, some might be certified who have not had the exceptional children course. This is mandated by statute, so that the State Board of Education could not waive this requirement. Thus to meet the statute it would still be necessary to review each applicant's credentials to determine whether or not the person completed such a course, if the person is certified after 7-1-1976. Of the 51 individuals who lacked the HB 671 requirement (i.e., they graduated after

7-1-1976 and did not have the course), 39 were from NCATE programs. Thus for these 39, the mandated statutory provision would not be covered if NCATE program completion were to constitute the only requirement. A change in the law would be needed.

Of the 110 persons who must take the CRT before a three-year professional certificate may be issued, 79 were NCATE program individuals.

Of the 12 persons who must complete some requirement other than the CRT or the exceptional children course before a three-year professional certificate may be issued, 7 completed NCATE programs. If NCATE program completion were the overriding consideration, the recency of study and the reading course requirement may have to be sacrificed for a few individuals. However, only a very small percentage of persons would fall in this category.

Of the 63 out-of-state applicants, or one-third of the total group, who will have to take additional course work to overcome the HB 671, recency of study, reading course, and other requirement deficiencies, 46 were graduates of NCATE programs.

Taught Before

Of the total group, 28 percent, or 53 individuals from out-of-state, had taught in other states before applying in Georgia. Of these, 37 were issued certificates without any additional requirements to be met. The remaining 16, although they have taught before, will have to complete various requirements, with completion of the HB 671 exceptional children course being the most frequent outstanding requirement to be met through coursework.

Endorsement Problems

Only 10 individuals out of the total group sought endorsements in various subject fields in which they had taught before, but were denied these endorsements because they did not meet the Georgia certification requirements for that particular field. They were granted some type of certificate (including the provisional type) in one field, although perhaps not in the field they wanted, or for which they had found an opening.

What States?

Of the 188 out-of-state applicants in this group, 29 percent were from Alabama. South Carolina was the next high supplier, with 14 percent. Tennessee comprised 11 percent, and North Carolina and Florida each 9 percent. The remaining 28 percent came from the rest of the nation.

Reciprocity

Accreditation via NCATE, which in 1979 was granted to 543 institutions in 48 states, is not a true reciprocity system for certification of teachers. The reason for this is that while state "A" may automatically recognize the credentials of an applicant from state "B" who completed an NCATE program in state "B", State "B" is under no obligation to recognize state "A"'s applicants in the same manner. In other words, the use of NCATE as a criterion of whether to recognize out-of-state program completers for certification is purely voluntary, with no reciprocal obligations between states. According to the survey conducted by SREB among state certification officers (see Appendix A), with 43 states plus the District of Columbia replying, 14 states do give some preferential treatment to applicants who completed NCATE programs. (See Columns (a) and (b) Table 1) This means transcripts are not checked, or not checked as carefully, for these applicants as would be the case for non-NCATE applicants.

Of the 14 states that do show some preferential processing treatment for NCATE program graduates, eight are states that belong to the ICP system. These eight states give this preferential processing treatment to NCATE program applicants who come from non-ICP states. The out-of-state applicants from ICP states would be given preferential processing under ICP rules in any event, regardless of whether they were NCATE program graduates.

NASDTEC Standards for the evaluation of teacher education programs within a state were used by 25 states and the District of Columbia according to the 1979 list of approved programs published by NASDTEC. (This excludes Georgia and Colorado whose programs are listed in the NASDTEC compilation although both states

TABLE 1

DOES NCATE PROGRAM MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

	Interstate Compact States				Non-Interstate Compact States			
	Yes-no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	Yes-not Same Detailed Review (c)	No Special Treatment (d)	Yes -no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	Yes-not Same Detailed Review (c)	No Special Treatment (d)
Alabama	X							
Alaska						X		
Arizona								X
Arkansas						X		
California				X				
Colorado								X
Connecticut				X				
Delaware				X				
Dist. of Col.				X				
Florida		X						
Georgia							X	
Hawaii				X				
Idaho				X				
Illinois		No Reply						
Indiana		X						
Iowa								X
Kansas							X	
Kentucky		No Reply						
Louisiana							X	
Maine			X					
Maryland		X						
Massachusetts			X					
Michigan							X	
Minnesota							X	
Mississippi					X			
Missouri						X		
Montana								X
Nebraska				X				
Nevada								X
New Hampshire				X				
New Jersey			X					
New Mexico								X
New York				X				

TABLE 1

DOES NCATE PROGRAM MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

	Interstate Compact States				Non-Interstate Compact States			
	Yes-no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	Yes-not Same Detailed Review (c)	No Special Treatment (d)	Yes -no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	Yes-not Same Detailed Review (c)	No Special Treatment (d)
North Carolina	X							
North Dakota						X		
Ohio				X				
Oklahoma			X					
Oregon								X
Pennsylvania		No Reply						
Rhode Island		X						
South Carolina						X		
South Dakota				X				
Tennessee								X
Texas								X
Utah		X						
Vermont		X						
Virginia				X				
Washington				X				
West Virginia				X				
Wisconsin								X
Wyoming								X

withdrew from the NASDTEC system.) According to the SREB survey, 34 states plus the District of Columbia indicate they now use the NASDTEC Standards, or standards that are virtually the same, to evaluate their teacher education programs. (See Table 2)

The NASDTEC Standards also do not guarantee reciprocity of certification of teachers between states. A state may use the NASDTEC Standards, but this does not automatically mean that it will certify applicants from other states that also use the NASDTEC Standards. According to the survey conducted by SREB, of the 34 states plus the District that indicate they do use NASDTEC Standards, only 13 states plus the District of Columbia indicate they do give some favorable treatment to applicants who completed programs approved under NASDTEC Standards in other states. There is no legal guarantee that their own applicants are similarly treated by the other states. (See Table 3)

The Interstate Certification Project system is the only one of the three systems that guarantees reciprocity between states. An ICP state may sign contracts with as many states as it chooses. The contracts are for five years, with the next common expiration date being September 30, 1984.

MAJOR ELEMENTS--ICP SYSTEM

As of July 1, 1980, in the current round of contract signing, 29 states plus the District of Columbia have signed the contract that pertains to teachers with one or more other states to provide reciprocity to each other's applicants. However, 33 states have been parties to ICP and will probably be included as the current round of contract signing proceeds.

Passage of enabling legislation is the first step before a state may enter into a reciprocity agreement. Thirty-six states and the District of Columbia

PROGRAM APPROVAL STANDARDS
EQUIVALENT TO NASDTEC STANDARDS?

Table 2

	Yes-We Consider equivalent (a)	Yes-Equivalent With Exceptions (b)	No-Our Standards Are Different (c) and (d)	Included on NASDTEC List of Approved Programs, 1979
* Alabama	X			X
Alaska	X			X
Arizona			X	
Arkansas			X	
* California	X			X **
Colorado			X	
* Connecticut			X	
* Delaware	X			X
* Dist. of Col.	X			X
* Florida	X			
Georgia	X			
* Hawaii	X			
* Idaho	X			X
Illinois	No Reply			
* Indiana		X		X
Iowa			X	
Kansas	X			X
Kentucky	No Reply			X
Louisiana			X	
* Maine			X	
* Maryland	X			X
* Massachusetts	X			X
Michigan			X	
Minnesota	X			X
Mississippi	X			
Missouri			X	
Montana	X			X **
* Nebraska	X			X
Nevada			X	
* New Hampshire	X			X
* New Jersey	X			X
New Mexico	X			X
* New York			X	
* North Carolina	X			X
North Dakota	X			
* Ohio		X		X
* Oklahoma	X			X
Oregon	X			
Pennsylavnia	No Reply			X
* Rhode Island	X			
South Carolina	X			X
* South Dakota		X		X
Tennessee	X			
Texas	X			

PROGRAM APPROVAL STANDARDS EQUIVALENT TO NASDTEC STANDARDS?

Table 2

	Yes-We Consider equivalent (a)	Yes-Equivalent With Exceptions (b)	No-Our Standards Are Different (c) and (d)	Included on NASDTEC List of Approved Programs, 1979
* Utah	X			X
* Vermont	X			X
* Virginia	X			X
* Washington	X			X
* West Virginia			X	
Wisconsin		X		X
Wyoming			X	

* A state that is party to Interstate Reciprocity Contracts
** These states' standards were also declared equivalent by NASDTEC as of June, 1980.

TABLE 3

DOES NASDTEC PROGRAM MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

	Interstate Compact States			Non-Interstate Compact States		
	Yes-no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	No Special Treatment (c)	Yes-no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	No Special Treatment (c)
Alabama		X				
Alaska						X
Arizona						X
Arkansas					X	
California			X			
Colorado						X
Connecticut			X			
Delaware		X				
Dist. of Col.	X					
Florida			X			
Georgia						X
Hawaii		X				
Idaho			X			
Illinois	No Reply					
Indiana			X			
Iowa						X
Kansas						X
Kentucky	No Reply					
Louisiana						X
Maine			X			
Maryland		X				
Massachusetts		X				
Michigan						X
Minnesota						X
Mississippi						X
Missouri						X
Montana						X
Nebraska			X			
Nevada						X
New Hampshire			X			
New Jersey		X				
New Mexico						X
New York			X			

TABLE 3

DOES NASDTEC PROGRAM MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

	Interstate Compact States			Non-Interstate Compact States		
	Yes-no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	No Special Treatment (c)	Yes-no Transcript Review (a)	Yes-if in Same Field (b)	No Special Treatment (c)
North Carolina	X					
North Dakota					X	
Ohio			X			
Oklahoma			X			
Oregon						X
Pennsylvania	No Reply					
Rhode Island		X				
South Carolina					X	
South Dakota			X			
Tennessee						X
Texas						X
Utah		X				
Vermont			X			
Virginia		X				
Washington			X			
West Virginia			X			
Wisconsin						X
Wyoming						X

have passed enabling legislation to permit their teacher education officers to grant reciprocity. But some of these states have not gone the next step of actually choosing states they wish to contract with, and then signing any such contracts. As of July 1, 1980, this is the status of the ICP contracts extending to 1984 that pertain to teachers:

NUMBER OF STATES WITH SIGNED RECIPROCITY CONTRACTS
THAT EXPIRE IN 1984

	Number of Signing States		Number of Signing States	In Process of Signing
Alabama	27	New Jersey	24	Kentucky
California	25	New York	25	Michigan
Connecticut	27	North Carolina	24	Wisconsin
Delaware	25	Oklahoma	26	Ohio
Florida	26	Pennsylvania	14	
Hawaii	26	Rhode Island	25	
Idaho	27	South Dakota	27	
Indiana	22	Utah	27	
Maine	26	Vermont	26	
Maryland	27	Virginia	26	
Massachusetts	26	Washington	25	
Nebraska	27	West Virginia	24	
New Hampshire	26	District of Columbia	22	

States that sign with each other have the following obligations:

1. They must have a set of standards by which they evaluate their own teacher education programs. This is any set of standards that the state education agency decides to use.

2. They must review their own teacher education programs by those standards every five years, with on-site team visits in which out-of-state representatives may participate.

3. They must send lists annually to all member states of all programs approved under the terms of the contract.

4. They must send names of all persons whose certificates have been revoked or suspended to all member states in the project office.

5. They must notify states who are signatories of significant changes in the standards for their program evaluations.

Under the ICP reciprocity system, receiving states must grant initial standard certification to applicants (a) who have completed approved programs in the contract states or (b) who hold teaching certificates issued by the originating state.

A. Receiving states must grant initial standard certificates to applicants from originating contract states if the applicants are graduates from programs approved by the originating states, with the following provisos:

1. The receiving state need not issue a certificate if the field certified by the originating state is not comparable to, or broader in scope than, the one being applied for in the receiving state. In other words, the receiving state need not issue a certificate for social sciences if the originating state program was only for history. Also, the receiving state may enforce its own requirement for a post-baccalaureate degree, even if that degree level is not required by the originating contract state.

2. All the noneducational requirements of the receiving state are met. This means that if the receiving state has a testing requirement, for example, this requirement still has to be met by the applicant. However, a reading or exceptional children course requirement in the receiving state (which is an educational requirement) would have to be sacrificed. Since the adoption of ICP by Georgia would require enabling legislation, passage of the standard enabling legislation would override HB-671 (exceptional children course)--the only statutory course requirement now in the Georgia laws.

3. Recency of study requirements in the receiving state may be enforced. Georgia requires 10 hours of credit within seven years preceding the application, or at least one year of teaching somewhere in the last seven years.

4. The receiving state may enforce a requirement that the teacher education program had to be in a regionally accredited institution.

So, for certification of teachers from other states who have not taught at least 27 months in the last seven years (see B below), Georgia would have to check:

1. Had the applicant completed an approved program in the contracting state and was the institution regionally accredited at the time the applicant was enrolled?

2. Was the scope of the subject area according to that state's certification requirements the same as Georgia's?

3. Was the recency of study requirement met?

4. Is the Georgia requirement on degree level for the area of certification sought no higher than the one the applicant has attained?

If the above provisions are met and if the applicant passes the CRT, the applicant is eligible for an initial regular certificate.

B. The receiving state must grant an initial regular certificate to any applicant who holds an initial or advanced regular certificate from any other contracting state without reference to whether the applicant completed an approved program in an accredited school, with the following provisos:

1. Has taught at least 27 months during the past seven years and at least 18 months of that time was in teaching a grade, subject, or subjects comparable to the one being sought by the applicant.

2. Meets all the noneducational requirements (testing may atill be required).

3. The applicant holds a baccalaureate or higher degree (provided, however, that the receiving state may still require a degree higher than a baccalaureate, even if that level was not required by the originating state that issued the certificate).

So, for certificated teachers in other states, Georgia would still have to check:

1. Is the field the same as for Georgia?

2. Is the degree level requirement the same as ours?

If the two conditions are met, does the applicant have the required teaching experience and does the applicant hold a baccalaureate?

ICP reciprocity eliminates the requirements on teacher applicants to take any special courses to obtain a regular initial certificate. In other words, teachers may not be sent back for additional courses for reading, exceptional children, or content courses if they completed an approved program or taught the same area for which they seek Georgia certification. This means that if Georgia were to enter into an ICP arrangement, it would want to insure that the state it chooses to contract with has similar standards for programs and similar certification requirements for specific fields, as in Georgia. With similar programs and/or certification requirements in the contract states, Georgia would run no great risk of accepting applicants who did not have substantially the same content preparation or experience as required in Georgia. The CRT is a further safeguard that may be applied as a final test.

Estimated Effect of ICP on Georgia's Applicants

The sample of out-of-state applicants whose records were analyzed (See page 7) was studied to determine what the effect of ICP would have been on their applications, both from the standpoint of State Department of Education evaluations and of the requirements upon the applicants.

Of the 188 persons in the sample, 117 applicants would have had expedited certification if ICP had been in effect, than is now the case. Three-fourths of these applicants from ICP states came from Florida, Alabama and North Carolina.

Of the 63 persons who under current regulations have to take further courses, 37 come from ICP states and would have been relieved of these requirements.

Of the 110 persons who are required to take the CRT, all would still be required to take the test, since this is a noneducational requirement that is not affected by any ICP contract. A more detailed analysis of the various categories of applicants is shown below:

Current Certification Procedures	If ICP Were in Effect
53 were issued standard certificates with no further provisos or requirements	35 came from ICP states. Their transcripts would not have been evaluated for course credits
69 lack only the CRT	45 came from ICP states. They would still take the CRT
41 lack the CRT and the special education course	25 came from ICP states. They would still take the CRT, but would be relieved of the special education course requirement
10 lack only the special education course	7 came from ICP states, and would be certified without the course
12 lack other course requirements for standard certification (Among the seven remaining ones, three are from ICP states, but would not be treated differently if ICP were in effect. One does not hold a certificate from the ICP state and has not completed an approved program in that state.	5 come from ICP states and hold valid teaching certificates from those states, and would therefore be relieved of further course requirements
	117 Total Affected

A second person is also from an ICP state, but from the information on the survey sheet, it is impossible to know whether the person would be treated differently if ICP were in effect. The third individual seeks a T-5 certification. ICP deals only with standard beginning certificates so that the person would not be treated differently if ICP were in effect.)

3 individuals were denied any type of certificate — None would be affected differently

2 individuals are from non-ICP states.
1 individual seeks librarian certification.
It is doubtful that initial action by Georgia to join ICP would include non-instructional personnel.

---

188 in sample

HISTORY of NCATE

NCATE was established in 1954 as a result of discussions by representatives of the National Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the NEA, the AACTE, NASDTEC and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

The original make-up of NCATE was: Six members each from AACTE and NEA, and three members each from CCSSO, NASDTEC and the NSBA. The National Commission on Accreditation denied NCATE recognition because only 6 of the 21 representatives were from higher education. The membership was therefore adjusted to give AACTE seven representatives out of a total of 19.

In 1963 a separate governing board was established to include only those organizations that contributed annual financial support. The membership of NCATE was again changed to increase the higher education representation to ten members.

By the late sixties, there was considerable dissension about the membership of NCATE. The NEA felt it did not have sufficient voice, with only 6 of 22 members, and threatened to withdraw. This led to protracted negotiations which culminated in a new constitution that provided equal representation to NEA and AACTE, transferred authority for the standards from AACTE to NCATE, and for the orderly addition of new constituent members of NCATE via associate membership first. Associate membership does not require financial support nor provide voting rights, but does provide input to additional groups, such as the American Personnel and Guidance Association, in the accreditation process by NCATE. Associate members become constituent members by vote of the constituent members.

The current constituent members of NCATE are as follows: eight representatives each from AACTE and NEA, and one each from the National School Boards Association, the Student NEA, NASDTEC, the American Association of School Administrators, the Council for Exceptional Children, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. The terms are three years.

Recently NASDTEC pulled out of NCATE. NASDTEC officials pointed to the possible conflict of interest in their roles as state approvers of teacher education programs and the NCATE role of accrediting programs. Also there was the question about the financial burden on NASDTEC. NCATE constituent membership annual dues are $8,500 for organizations with one representative.

Evaluation of the future importance of NCATE accreditation differs depending on the source. AACTE feels NCATE is the most promising route to pursue for interstate monitoring of the quality of teacher education programs. Some NASDTEC officials, however, point to improvements in state monitoring of their own teacher education programs, and to the financial burden of NCATE accreditation. According to this view, some excellent programs do not pursue NCATE accreditation because of the cost, and the feeling that State approval is sufficient. The cost of NCATE accreditation to a college consists of annual fees ($250 per program plus surcharges for each program over the first one) and the one-time accreditation fees which in 1978-79 ranged from $1100 to $2200 depending on the number of program categories accredited. The one-time accreditation fee has now been revised so that it too will become payable in annual installments. The cost of the team visits is also borne by the institutions.

The standards of NCATE have undergone many revisions. The current standards were adopted in 1977. The responsibility for changes in the standards lies

with the standing Committee on Standards, although the Council has the final decision on standards. The Committee on Standards meets three times annually. The current membership of the Committee is made up of two representatives each from NEA and AACTE and one each from AASA and NASP.

The second standing committee is one on Process and Evaluation whose function it is to monitor and evaluate the processes used to apply the standards.

Proposed changes in the Standards must be circulated to all Council members, accredited institutions, and constituent member organizations four months prior to their being considered. A two-thirds vote is required to change the Standards.

There has been criticism through the years that NCATE accreditation was not strict enough, and that the teams sent out were sometimes not competent, insufficiently independent of the institutions they visited, and not representative. In response to these charges, efforts have been made to improve the teams and the evaluation of programs. According to NCATE the denial rate in the early seventies was less than ten percent. It steadily increased and in 1979 it was 31 percent, with 21 institutions denied accreditation. Of these, nine appealed, with the result that five were remanded for further evaluation, one was granted, and three sustained in the denial.

The make-up of the teams that visit institutions must now meet certain guidelines. No more than one-half may be from higher education, the rest representing K-12 plus a student in a teacher education program. An effort is made not to send persons to campuses where they may have a conflict of interest. Also no team member may be from the same state as the institution visited. The nominations for the lists of prospective team members are divided as follows: NEA, AACTE and the remaining constituent members each nominate one-third.

The list has around 3,000 names. About 100 teams go out in one year, each composed of 8-14 persons. An institution may veto, but not nominate a team member or chairperson. About one-fourth of the chairpersons are vetoed. NCATE then supplies a new person.

HISTORY OF NASDTEC

NASDTEC was organized in 1928. The purpose of NASDTEC is to exercise leadership in matters related to the preparation and certification of professional school personnel. It is composed of the directors of teacher preparation and certification of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, with each person having one vote. The development and application of standards to evaluate teacher preparation programs in each state is not the only function of NASDTEC.

It was not until 1951 that a set of standards for approval of teacher education programs became part of NASDTEC's agenda. The first set of standards developed under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education and culminated in Circular 351. The objective of developing such standards was to strive for some uniformity in the standards that states individually apply to insure quality of their own teacher education programs. As a result of such uniformity, it was hoped that states could place greater reliance on the quality of the preparation of out-of-state teacher applicants who presumably completed programs to which a common set of standards would be applied.

The Circular 351 Standards have been revised over the years and the current set of NASDTEC Standards was last revised in 1979. NASDTEC has a standing Committee on Standards, with at least one member from each of the four geographic regions into which the states are divided. The regional vice-presidents nominate the members of the Standards Committee, and the President of NASDTEC appoints a chairperson. These Committee members serve

for three-year terms. Proposals for changes in the Standards must be circulated, and are voted on in a general membership meeting. NASDTEC membership meetings are held twice annually. Each state pays $200 annual dues to NASDTEC.

NASDTEC membership does not imply mandatory use of the NASDTEC Standards. Each state makes its own determination as to what standards it will use to approve its teacher education programs.

The current chairman of the NASDTEC Standards Committee is Dr. Vere McHenry, from the Utah State Department of Education, who has served as chairman for four years.

HISTORY OF INTERSTATE CERTIFICATION PROJECT

The ICP grew out of a Title V Elementary and Secondary Education grant in 1965 to the New York State Department of Education to explore means to reduce certification barriers to interstate movement of teachers. Forty-nine states attended a meeting in New York City and gave unanimous support to the idea of designing an interstate certification system to reduce the red tape qualified applicants experienced in moving from state to state.

During the next several years Project staff, aided by experts in the field of interstate relations, decided upon and devised an interstate certification compact. This vehicle was used because certification within a state is legally based, and therefore the exchange of certificates among states should also be legally based. This interstate certification compact entitled "The Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel," was reviewed and revised by the Council of State Governments, the National Governors Advisory Council and professional educators from across the nation.

Agreement was reached on a model statute by the winter of 1967. Through enactment of this enabling legislation, states are then permitted to make

interstate certification contracts with other party states.

In 1967 four states (Maryland, Massachusetts, California and New York) enacted the enabling legislation. Today thirty-eight jurisdictions have passed the required interstate certification legislation.

Under the terms of the Interstate Agreement, four contracts were devised, which remain in effect for five years. Four contracts were developed to cover: 1) teachers, 2) administrators, 3) support personnel and 4) vocational education personnel with less than a baccalaureate degree. These contracts cover a five-year term and must then be renewed. The current set of contracts will expire September 30, 1984. A state may sign contracts with other states to cover as many of the four categories as it decides. Thirty-three states have signed contracts covering teachers, 13 to cover administrators, 15 to cover support personnel and 11 to cover the vocational group.

The ICP is governed by the Contract Administrators Association, a legal governing body composed of chief state school officers or their designees in states that are parties to a contract. A state which has an interest in the Interstate Agreement, but which does not have a contract in force, may be represented in the Association by a non-voting observer.

The Association elects an executive committee at its annual meeting for three-year terms. The director of the Interstate Certification Project serves as Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

From its origin in 1965, the financing of ICP has come primarily from federal sources. Continued federal funding for ICP is currently in doubt. Neither is it known whether the states will pick up the cost of the central administration of ICP which continues to be housed in the New York State Department of Education in Albany. Most states have signed contracts to 1984, and it would seem reasonable to expect that the reciprocity system will remain viable, given the number of existing contracts now dependent on the system.

THE OPINIONS OF GEORGIA SCHOOL PERSONNEL ON RECIPROCITY

In order to evaluate the reaction of Georgia school personnel to the establishment of some form of reciprocity in certifying out-of-state applicants, a brief questionnaire was sent to all Georgia school superintendents, 200 principals and 300 teachers in the State's school districts. The sample of teachers was limited to those who have held certificates three or fewer years in Georgia. The reason for limiting the survey to this group is that the certification process may be better known to these teachers than to those who were certified long ago. The 300 teachers included in the survey represent 3 percent of the total population of classroom teachers with that length of experience in the Georgia schools. The principals and teachers were randomly selected. A total of 139 superintendents, 134 principals, and 156 teachers responded. A sample of the survey instruments is included as Appendix B.

In response to a question about the effect of a reciprocity system that might sacrifice the evaluation of transcripts and therefore of some courses that applicants may not have completed, 78 percent of the superintendents and 69 percent of the principals indicated they felt such a change in procedures would have no appreciable effect on the quality of out-of-state teachers employed. The question did include the proviso that applicants would still have to take and pass the Criterion Referenced Tests. Despite this proviso, 17 percent of the superintendents and 25 percent of the principals did feel a change in the certification procedures could have a bad effect on the quality of out-of-state teachers. The remaining 5 percent for both groups gave other comments regarding the effect of the change.

The second question asked of superintendents and principals deals with the effect that extra course requirements have on the availability of out-of-state applicants required to take extra courses to meet current certification requirements. Among the superintendents, 65 percent indicated that not many teachers had

been lost just because of the additional course requirements for professional certification, and 70 percent gave this response among the principals. The remainder of both groups indicated that a considerable number of teachers were lost because of the additional course requirements.

The third question sought the respondent's evaluation on how critical the current need might be to import out-of-state teachers to fill classrooms. The response, "We had more problems in filling teaching positions in the last two years than was the case in earlier years, and we should do everything possible to expedite the certification process for out-of-state teachers," was the more frequent response. Among the superintendents, 60 percent chose this response, and 46 percent of the principals,

The response, "We had more problems in filling teaching positions in the last two years..., but the problem is not severe enough to change certification procedures..." received 22 percent of the superintendents' responses, and 14 percent of the principals' responses. The third possible response on the survey instrument, "We had no more problems in filling teaching positions...therefore changing the certification procedures for out-of-state applicants is not justified from the standpoint of teacher shortage," was the answer given by 18 percent of the superintendents and 40 percent of the principals.

The superindendents were also asked to list the three fields in which they have experienced the greatest problems in locating teachers, in the order of the greatest difficulty of filling jobs. The fields listed by the superintendents are shown below:

SCARCITY FIELDS LISTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS

	Most Difficult to Fill	2nd Most Difficult to Fill	3rd Most Difficult to Fill	Total
Spec. Ed., Learning Disab., Behavior Disorders, M.R.	36	39	28	103
Math	34	29	21	84

SCARCITY FIELDS LISTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS

	Most Difficult to Fill	2nd Most Difficult to Fill	3rd Most Difficult to Fill	Total
Science, Physics, Chemistry	8	21	25	54
Speech Path., Therapy	31	3	3	37
Ind. Arts, Voc.-Agric.	4	8	5	17
Middle Grades	2	3	5	10

All other fields listed in total by less than 10 superintendents

Teacher Responses

The survey instrument sent to the teachers was designed especially to determine whether there would be a great deal of resentment on the part of current teachers if the reciprocity arrangement might mean some future teachers would be excused from having to take some of the required courses that current teachers had to take. The responses of teachers who had taught in other states were tallied separately from those who had taught only in Georgia schools. At least two-thirds of both groups indicated they had no objection to expedited certification of out-of-state applicants even if this would mean they might not have taken the same courses the current teachers were required to take. The question was worded with the proviso that the Criterion Referenced Tests would still be required of out-of-state applicants.

The teachers were not quite as certain that they were willing to sacrifice course requirements for expedited certification of out-of-state applicants when the same question, worded slightly differently, was posed to them again. Forty-two percent responded that even with the Criterion Referenced Tests and the performance evaluation process that would apply across the board they would not be willing to sacrifice the course requirements for out-of-state teachers even if this does discourage such applicants from teaching in Georgia. When only the teachers who have taught in other states are included, the proportion that stands fast on course

requirements is lower: only 16 percent hold this position.

The third question seeks to determine whether the current teachers would favor a loosening of the certification process for out-of-state applicants only if the same privilege were then extended to them if they apply to other states. Half of the respondents indicated they could favor a change only if it were a reciprocal one that also gave Georgia teachers an advantage for applying elsewhere. One-third of those who have not taught elsewhere, and 10 percent of those who have taught in other states indicate they do not favor any loosening of the certification procedures for out-of-state teachers, regardless of benefits Georgia teachers might derive from the change. The remainder, 18 percent of in-state and 32 percent of out-of-state teachers, favor loosening the certification requirements for out-of-state applicants even if the same privilege is not granted to Georgia teachers.

In summary, the majority of school personnel, from superintendents to teachers, does favor expediting the certification process of out-of-state applicants, although there is a minority group that does not see a need to make any changes.

A large proportion of the respondents added comments in addition to marking the multiple choice answers to the questions. The responses generally indicate a distrust of the certification process, including the Criterion Referenced Tests and the performance evaluation. Some comments indicate the unwillingness of teachers to have out-of-state applicants certified with less than or different requirements as apply currently, while others stress that additional course requirements to meet certification regulations may impede attention to their classrooms.

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND NASDTEC STANDARDS

Procedures	NASDTEC	NCATE
Frequency of program reviews	Every 5 years	Was every 10 years. Now every 7 years, except that after 5 years a mini-review may be given, which if successful, extends approval for another 5 yrs.
Teams	Appt. by State agency with consultation of institution and school of education. No formal provisions of how the team is to be composed. No formal provisions of how list of team members is to be assembled.	Appt. by NCATE. Institution may veto a team member or chairman, but may not nominate. Teams are to be composed of 50% higher ed. representatives, the rest being school people, and a student representative. There are formal procedures of how list of NCATE panels are nominated. The various constituencies of NCATE nominate members for the list.
Self Study by Dept. of College of Institution	This is required. Format of this institutional report is specified, with forms to be completed.	This is required. Format for institutional report is spelled out.
Procedures for Team Members	Forms are specified for use of team members, who are to be briefed before going out on a review.	Forms are specified for use of team members.
Prerequisites	No mention is made about the need for regional accreditation.	The institution must be regionally accredited. Also it must be state-approved. However, because of timing differences, a program's state approval may run out while the NCATE approval is still in force. Thus conceivably a program might have NCATE approval and not State approval. Anecdotal evidence that this occurs exists.

Procedures	NASDTEC	NCATE
Scope of Approval	Each separate program offered by a school of education (i.e., specialty or field) is given separate approval.	The NCATE accreditation is for all basic or advanced programs for any one type of personnel (e.g., K-12), and not by specialties. To gain accreditation, a school of education must present evidence on all its specialty offerings. They stand or fall together.
Number of Approvals	The most recent list (1979) shows 28 states. For each state the institutions are listed, plus an identification of the number of approved programs in that institution. For Alabama, for example, there are 30 colleges listed, with 525 approved programs. The total number of colleges listed in the 28 states is 631.	The most recent list (1979-80) shows 48 states and D.C., with 543 colleges approved. For the states covered by the NASDTEC list, the number of colleges listed by NCATE is 313, or one-half as many as NASDTEC approves in those same states. In Alabama, for example, 13 colleges are listed with 47 programs at the bachelor's level.
Type of Accreditation Listed	For various programs, from agric. to voc. education. Nothing is specified on the list about the degree level.	For various levels of personnel (teachers, supts., principals, counselors, etc.) by degree level. Nothing is shown about specialties.

Substantive Issues

The major issues addressed by both sets of standards are the same, although the sequence, the way the standard is addressed, and the specificity of how the standards are described vary between the two. The following is a discussion of the similarities and differences of the two sets of standards.

Governance. Both sets of standards call for an officially designated unit in the college that has the responsibility for the teacher education program.

Objectives. Both sets of standards call for explicit statement of the program objectives and how these objectives are to be met by the program.

Multicultural Sensitivity. Both sets of standards emphasize the importance of this in the preparation of the teacher, via the general and professional curriculum phases.

Liaison with Schools. Both sets of standards stress the importance of close relationships between the school of education and the elementary and secondary schools for which teachers are prepared. This emphasis is seen in the standards that pertain to faculty (in both sets of standards faculty are to be experienced in the schools) and in the arrangements for the practicum which stress the importance of close communication between the two sectors.

Curriculum. Both sets of standards divide the curriculum into the general and professional phases, with the professional phase to cover content of the teaching specialties, as well as courses in methods, foundations, and the theories of teaching and learning, plus the practicum.

On the development of content courses, both sets of standards refer to the use of materials prepared by professional associations in the various fields, and to the need for student participation in program evaluation and development.

Practicum. Both sets of standards emphasize the need for a substantial, supervised practicum in schools where student teachers will receive quality supervision. Coordination between the college and the school in developing good student teaching experiences is valued in both sets of standards.

Faculty. Both sets of standards stress the need for well prepared faculty who are teaching courses for which they are specifically prepared. The need for faculty to have had experience in the public schools is stressed by each set of standards.

Faculty loads are to be reasonable in both sets of standards, and the part-time faculty is to meet the same requirements as the full-time faculty. There are to be clear personnel policies on selection, retention, promotion, etc. of faculty, and an explicit system of monitoring performance of the faculty. Opportunities for faculty development are to be evident under both sets of standards.

Students. Both sets of standards call for published criteria for admission of students to the teacher education programs. Evaluative criteria for student retention are to be clearly stated. Counseling and advising, including placement functions, are to be part of the program.

Resources and Facilities. Both sets of standards call for adequacy of both library and media center facilities and materials. The resources of the entire institution are to be adequate.

Evaluation, Program Review, and Planning. Both sets of standards call for systematic evaluation of the quality of the program's graduates. Programs are to be monitored continuously in terms of new developments in teacher preparation, and modifications are to be made where appropriate.

In sum, the major topics that are dealt with in both sets of standards are the same, and no real differences exist in terms of the overall mandates of what is important in teacher education programs.

Differences in the Standards

Although there are no major differences in the overall subject areas covered by the two sets of standards, there is considerable variation in how these subject areas are addressed. Generally, the NASDTEC Standards are more specific. For example, the NASDTEC Standards enumerate the content area or competencies for 28 specialties (exclusive of the subspecialties under some of these specialties). The NCATE Standards do not mention what is required for various specialties. This is left to the decisions mutually made by the schools of education and the arts and science faculties that offer these specialty courses, under the general admonition that the guidelines provided by the professional societies are to be used.

The NCATE Standards, although more specific in requiring that general education comprise one-third of the curriculum, are less specific in enumerating the competencies to be developed by the general courses. Other examples of specificity in the NASDTEC Standards, as compared to the NCATE ones, are the requirements that the library be headed by a professional librarian, that explicit budget data be available, with audited financial reports, that student records be maintained by the college or department of education that clearly show each student's courses and practicum experience, and that coordinators be available in the public school systems in which student teachers are placed.

The NASDTEC Standards give a specific limit on the number of student teachers to be supervised by a faculty member. The NCATE Standards have a general admonition against overloading faculty.

One area in which the NCATE Standards are more specific than the NASDTEC Standards relates to the degree levels of faculty. The NCATE Standards specify that each faculty member have "post-master's degree preparation and/or

demonstrated scholarly competence and appropriate specialization." The NASDTEC Standards state "faculty members . . . have had specific preparation for their roles in teacher education."

An example of the difference in how a standard is addressed, although the overall subject matter of the standard is addressed by both NCATE and NASDTEC, is offered below. The NCATE Standard regarding the practicum covers the criteria in broad brush strokes. The NASDTEC treatment is more specific.

NCATE Standard 2.3.4:

> The professional studies component of each curriculum for prospective teachers includes direct, substantial, quality participation in teaching over an extended period of time in an elementary or secondary school. This practicum should be under the supervision of college personnel who are experienced in, and have continuing experience with, elementary or secondary teaching, and certificated, experienced personnel from the cooperating school. Explicit criteria are established and applied for the selection of school supervisors and for the assignment of college personnel.

NASDTEC Standard 3.3 VI:

> Student teaching, or other major practicums, shall be designed both as a growth experience and as an opportunity for evaluation of a student's potential for teaching. Student teaching shall provide an opportunity for assessing a student's commitment to teaching, skill in guiding learning in inter-personal relations, and growth as a professional in teaching.
>
> In considering the approval of teacher education programs, the following statements shall be used for evaluating student teaching programs. These statements are not all-inclusive. Teacher education institutions shall develop student teaching programs of a quality superior to that implied.
>
> A. Admission to Student Teaching. Student teaching shall be permitted only after a comprehensive professional review of the student's record indicates that scholarhsip, performance in an area of specialization, competence in the professional sequence, performance in previous professional experiences, and personal characteristics qualify the student for the responsibilities of student teaching.

B. Intensity. Student teaching shall be a comprehensive experience with expanding responsibilities, including the full range of activities of a teacher in a school situation.

C. Length of Program. A student teaching experience shall provide for intensive and continuous involvement. The length of student teaching shall depend upon the performance of the student teacher. It shall continue until objectives of the program have been achieved.

D. The Cooperating School. The cooperating school or school system shall be chosen by the institution on the basis of the commitment of the administrators and staff members to participation in the preparation of new teachers.

E. The Cooperating Teacher. Cooperating teachers shall be selected jointly by school and institutional personnel. In addition to being certificated and experienced in the area of assignment, the cooperating teacher shall have a good performance record, show continued professional growth, and have the temperament, desire, and ability to work with student teachers.

The number of student teachers assigned to any qualified cooperating teacher shall be determined by applying two professional criteria: (a) the level of support for pupil learning shall remain as high or higher than if the student teachers were not so assigned, and (b) the teacher can feel comfortable and confident in providing an effective, supportive learning climate.

F. Institutional Responsibility for Supervision. Institutions shall study and develop effective arrangements for administering and supervising student teaching programs. Since student teaching is a comprehensive continuous experience, the student shall have the expertise available to assist with content, methodology, inter-personal relations and professional development. While there are many varieties of student teaching supervision, the institution and cooperating school system shall strive to develop a quality system which best utilizes the resources of the institutional supervisor, cooperating teacher and student. Where the institutional supervisor

functions as a generalist, the institution and school system shall assure that expertise in content and methodology in the subject area is available to the student. All institutions shall study possible alternative arrangements for administering and supervising student teaching including the use of clinical professors. Institutions and schools shall make cooperative detailed studies of roles and responsibilities. Such studies assist in determining the strengths and weaknesses of supervision and in developing means to upgrade continually the skills in teacher activities of all personnel involved. Institutional staff who have responsibility for supervision shall have equal status with other faculty. To assure adequate supervision, a full-time supervisor shall be responsible for not more than 24 student teachers. Under most circumstances the number should be considerably less.

ANALYSIS OF NASDTEC STANDARDS, AS COMPARED TO THE GEORGIA STANDARDS FOR APPROVING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Chapter I

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURAL STANDARDS

This section described the major procedures a state is to follow in adopting and administering its standards.

I The state shall adopt explicit standards. This Georgia has also done.

II There shall be an advisory group to provide continuous review of programs and implementation of standards, with professionals from all levels of education and other citizens concerned with teacher education.

The Georgia Teacher Education Council might be interpreted to be such an advisory group, although its makeup is not as broad as the NASDTEC Standard implies. The Georgia Professional Standards Commission also had the responsibility of making recommendations to the State Department of Education regarding standards for teacher education programs.

III There shall be a state officer responsible for teacher education and certification as liaison with teacher education institutions. That Georgia has too.

V Visiting teams to evaluate the programs shall be broadly representative of the education community. The team is appointed by the state agency. The team Chairperson is to be a cooperative choice by the state, university president, and the head of the Education Department or Division. The provisions under NASDTEC and Georgia Standards are similar.

VI The programs are to be reviewed every five years. This is the same as in Georgia. However, Georgia also has a provision for temporary one-year approvals, which is not a part of the NASDTEC Standards. The one-year provision is for new programs.

VII and VIII These standards state that the State shall prepare a manual with criteria and evaluation forms for the program review process. Georgia does have published criteria (not in a manual, however) but no forms for the review committee. Also, the NASDTEC Standards provide that a list be published of the approved programs. Georgia does keep a list of its approved programs.

Chapter II

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

2.1 Purposes and Objectives of the Programs

This standard provides for a clear statement of the purposes of each teacher education program, to be included in the college catalog, with

these statements tieing into the certification levels, grade spans, and subject fields that the state certification requirements provide.

Also the objectives of each program are to be stated clearly and formally. The Georgia Standards provide for these items, although they do so less explicitly. For example, nothing is provided in the Georgia Standards that the purposes of the teacher education programs must be spelled out in the college catalogs.

2.2 Organization of the Institution

The NASDTEC Standards specify that control of the institution shall be vested in a board of trustees or otherwise designated board, with staggered terms of office for the board members. The Georgia Standards say nothing about how the institution is to be governed. The Georgia Standards require accreditation of the institution by the regional accrediting agency. No mention of such accreditation is made by the NASDTEC Standards.

The NASDTEC Standards call for the existence of an organization chart of the institution. This is not specified in the Georgia Standards. In addition the NASDTEC Standards require written personnel policies, and administrative policies. The Georgia Standards also require existence of personnel policies, but nothing is mentioned about their having to be published, nor any mention of administrative policies.

As evidence of sufficient financial resources, the NASDTEC Standards require an annual financial statement that is audited, and a budget. Also financial reports are to clearly reveal the relative amounts, as compared to other programs, that are expended in teacher education for instruction, administration, maintenance, equipment, etc.

The Georgia Standards also mention that there shall be financial adequacy for the teacher education program, but no further statements are made about written reports or the type of data that is to be available.

2.3 Student Admission, Retention, etc.

Both NASDTEC and the Georgia Standards require that orderly records be maintained on the students enrolled in the education program.

The NASDTEC Standards do specify that specific admission standards into the education programs are to be published. No such requirement as to being "published" are included in the Georgia Standards.

Both standards call for evaluation procedures of teacher education students to be applied for continuing improvement of programs. The NASDTEC Standards are more specific. For example, they specifically require a well defined plan to evaluate graduates. The Georgia Standards say that the program "shall provide evidence of program evaluation procedures." Georgia

Standards state, "the institution's measure of academic quality (at least "C" average) for those entering school positions will be such as to reflect quality of the student in his total studies at the college."

2.4 Student Personnel Services

Both standards provide that the institution and the program shall provide counseling to its students, including placement services, and supply and demand data on the market for teachers. Also, both standards call for maintenance of records on the students. The NASDTEC Standards are more specific in some respects. For example, they specify that students are to receive written information on the available personnel services. Also an advisor is to be appointed for each teacher education student. (The Georgia Standards just say the head of teacher education is the titular advisor of all students.) The NASDTEC Standards specify that the records to be kept on each student shall include all course titles taken, credits, and a description in full of the professional lab experience. Also the NASDTEC Standards require periodic follow-up surveys of the program's graduates.

2.5 Student Participation in Teacher Education Program

The NASDTEC Standards call for joint student-faculty committees, and established channels for student input into the programs. The Georgia Standards make no specific reference to student inputs.

2.6 Faculty

Both sets of standards contain a set of standards about faculty. The subjects covered relate to specific preparation of faculty for the roles they fill, evidence that their preparation related to elementary and secondary schools (Georgia adds "public" schools), evidence that there is faculty development taking place (Georgia adds that there should be funding shown for such activities), that there are effective personnel policies on promotions, tenure, etc., and that part-time faculty meet the same standards as full-time faculty. Also the total load is to take into account non-instructional activities. These various topics are covered more or less to the same degree in both sets of standards, with the one major difference that the Georgia Standards specify the director of the program shall have a doctorate, while no such mention is made in the NASDTEC Standards.

2.6.1 Instructional Methods

The NASDTEC Standards indicate that the program shall utilize a variety of instruction styles. Also the program is to collect data on the performance of the students, such as their standardized tests and their performance if they go on to graduate schools.

These items are not specifically addressed in the Georgia Standards.

2.7 Facilities and Instructional Materials

Both the Georgia and NASDTEC Standards speak to the physical resources in terms of buildings, and the availability of materials. There is no substantial difference, in that both sets of standards fully outline the kinds (not the amounts) of materials and supplies that should be on hand. The one substantial difference is that the NASDTEC Standards require that a library be available with modern practices of library management administered by a professional librarian. This is not mentioned in the Georgia Standards.

2.8 School-Institutional Arrangements

Both the Georgia and NASDTEC Standards emphasize the need for strong coordination between the schools and the institution to insure that the laboratory experience of students will be meaningful. Both standards relate to the kinds of schools, and the kind of support from the schools and the institutions, that are to be provided. The NASDTEC Standards are somewhat more specific in that they require "explicit and publicized working relationships" between the school and the institution, and call for an identifiable coordinator in each school system to oversee the laboratory experiences.

Chapter III

CURRICULUM -- BASIC PROGRAMS

3.1 Curriculum Development, Planning and Patterns

Both sets of standards call for the responsibility for the teacher education program to be centralized in the school of education. Both call for cooperation in planning and developing the programs by school personnel, state education agencies and professional associations in conjunction with the education faculty.

Both sets of standards place the responsibility on the head of the department or school of education for recommending the students to the state agency for certification.

Both sets of standards describe a curriculum that is made up of general education, professional education, and specialized education for the field or grade levels the program covers.

3.2 General Education

Both sets of standards call for general education to cover social-behavioral sciences, mathematics and natural sciences, humanities, and the fine and applied arts.

The Georgia Standards indicate that each graduate should demonstrate basic competence in communicative and computational skills. The NASDTEC Standards enumerate various general competencies that should be covered, among which are communication skills and mathematical concepts.

3.3 Professional Education

The NASDTEC Standards are somewhat broader (less specific) in terms of competencies to be covered here. Yet both imply, but do not specify, a course sequence of foundations, developmental psychology, learning psychology, methods, media, and curriculum. The NASDTEC Standards do specify as a necessary competency to be gained in professional education the ability to teach reading skills to the appropriate group or level for the program that is involved. This standard is included in the Georgia criteria of September 10, 1978, which requires a five-hour course in the teaching of reading for teachers of English, Speech, and Foreign Languages.

The Georgia Standards here call for the inclusion of a course on exceptional children (HB 671).

Student Teaching

Both sets of standards address the necessity for a closely supervised student teaching experience in a school that will provide a meaningful experience.

The Georgia Standards specify that the student teaching shall be one full-time quarter. The NASDTEC Standards only state that the teaching shall be long enough so that the objectives of the program are achieved.

The Georgia Standards call for a load of approximately 15 students per quarter in full-time laboratory experience per one full-time faculty member. The NASDTEC Standards call for a maximum of 24 student teachers per faculty member.

The NASDTEC Standards do specify that no student is to be admitted to student teaching until after a professional review of the student that he or she is ready to benefit from the experience.

Also the NASDTEC Standards, for evaluating the laboratory experience, specify that "where the institutional supervisor functions as a generalist, the institution and the school system shall assure that expertise in content and methodology in the subject area is available to the student." This criterion that supervision must be available in the student teacher's field of specialization is not included in the Georgia Standards.

3.4 Teaching Majors, or Specialization Areas

Both sets of standards include separate criteria or standards for various teaching fields or specialties, or grade levels. The Georgia criteria are developed by subcommittees of the Teacher Education Council. The Georgia

criteria for various specialties have been written over a period of years, from the early sixties to as late as 1979. The NASDTEC Standards for teacher specialties are an integral part of the entire manual on State Standards.

The NASDTEC Standards specify that a statement of purpose for each major or field of specialization is to be prepared by the faculty concerned with teacher education in the program offering that major or field. No such directive is included in the Georgia Standards.

The NASDTEC Standards direct that each program offering a certain major give a clear statement of the competencies in that major or field that the program is designed to produce.

The major difference is that while both NASDTEC and the Georgia Standards include a list of competencies or subject areas that are to be covered in each major or specialty area, the NASDTEC Standards also require the programs to provide their own statements of the competencies that they deem as necessary for any specialty they offer.

The NASDTEC Standards state that the teaching major or field of specialization shall be staffed by faculty who are well-qualified by graduate training and experience in the subject matter, and shall be sensitive to the needs of public school teachers.

The Georgia Standards include statements in some of the individual specialty criteria regarding staff qualifications. The overall directive on this point in the Georgia Standards is that "Instruction in the subject matter of any teaching field should be under the direction of staff members who qualify as faculty members in regionally accredited institutions. Faculty members responsible for teaching field courses shall be considered for that assignment based on preparation and experience."

COMPARISON OF GEORGIA AND NASDTEC STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC TEACHING FIELDS (Undergraduate Levels)

ART

Both sets of standards are stated in terms of competencies instead of required course credits. Although worded and arranged differently, the same elements are included in both sets of standards. The only major exception is that the NASDTEC Standards call for the student's understanding and appreciation of related art areas such as dance, film, music, literature, theatre, and the practical arts. The Georgia Standards enumerate that the program include experiences in drawing, painting, graphics, sculpture and three-dimensional construction, ceramics, jewelry, metal work, and weaving.

BUSINESS EDUCATION (Grades 7-12)

The Georgia Standards are for programs to prepare students in (1) comprehensive business education (all except business data processing); (2) bookkeeping and business management (all except shorthand, transcription, and business data processing); and (3) business data processing and accounting (all except shorthand and transcription). The standards do not specify the competencies to be covered in the above areas. The NASDTEC Standards are for business education programs to prepare students in (1) accounting-bookkeeping and data processing; (2) clerical office occupation; and (3) secretarial occupation. Each program must cover in depth concentration in one or more of these areas. Standards do specify competencies to be covered, such as basic competencies of computer logic, programming, and storage for the first area of specialization.

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Both sets of standards are in terms of competencies and not required course credits. The NASDTEC Standards call for competencies in purchasing, marketing, merchandising, and management. The Georgia Standards call for competencies in advertising and sales promotion, merchandising, marketing, economics, product and service knowledge, operations and management, and human relations. The Georgia Standards explicitly call for developing abilities to perform guidance functions (career information and on-the-job training placement) and to work with community resources.

DRAMA SPECIALISTS

Both sets of standards are in terms of competencies and not required course credits. The NASDTEC Standards place greater emphasis on developing the student's practical ability to lead a drama program in a school situation, with the limitations of time, funds, and other resources.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
(This covers programs through kindergarten or through the 3rd grade in the Georgia Standards)

Both sets of standards are in terms of competencies, not course requirements. They generally cover the same ground, although in a different format. Both include competencies of working with parents and paraprofessionals. The NASDTEC Standards tend to lay greater stress on competencies for administering and managing day care programs.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
(Georgia Criteria - 1964)

Both sets of standards are stated in terms of competencies, and not credit course requirements. The Georgia Standards call for study in "content and methods of the curriculum area commonly found in the elementary school." This includes the reading process and related language arts, the cultural, social, political, geographical, and industrial forces which operate in society, the sciences, history and world culture, real number systems and basic concepts of algebra, art and music media, and health and physical education. The methods emphases in these areas are to develop interrelationships between fields, use of the scientific methods, skill in selecting teaching materials, and ability to build a sequence on concepts into a curriculum. The standards call for an area of concentration in a field included in the elementary curriculum.

The specialized professional portion of the elementary program under the NASDTEC Standards shall include the study of methods and materials for various curriculum areas. Traditionally, academic majors in a single discipline are deemed too narrow by NASDTEC as a basis for elementary school teachers. However, to permit some specialization, programs may stress specialization in addition to background in all the elementary subjects or a large enough block of electives to permit a single field major or to acquire depth in more than one of the elementary curriculum areas.

The NASDTEC Standards make reference to preparation for teaching of reading skills in the following manner: "competency in teaching methods and use of materials to promote the effective pupil language art skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening." Content areas are to also include art, health, mathematics, music, physical education, science, and social studies. The use of

methods and materials in these subject areas is to be developed. The program is to provide adequate preparation for atypical children and for diagnosis of their learning difficulties, and skills of working with parents.

ENGLISH
(Georgia, Grades 7-12)
(NASDTEC, no grade level specified)

Both sets of standards describe competencies and not course requirements. The NASDTEC Standards are somewhat more general; for example, "composition" is not specifically mentioned, while it is mentioned in the Georgia Standards. The NASDTEC Standards do call for knowledge of the processes by which one learns to read. The Georgia Standards specifically endorse the "Guidelines for the Preparation of English Teachers" of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and the Modern Language Association of America. The Georgia Standards indicate that admission procedures to the program should be a cooperative effort by the departments of education and of English.

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
(Georgia - 1970)

Georgia Standards list the following classifications within exceptional children programs: behavior disorders, gifted, hearing impairment, physically handicapped, learning disabilities, mental retardation, mobility education, speech impairment, and visually impaired. A program should cover basic studies on all areas of special education which are outlined above, but depth in one area of specialization with a practicum in that area is required. Competencies are outlined for each area of specialization.

The NASDTEC Standards include the following classifications of exceptional children: emotionally disturbed, hearing impaired, mental retardation, physically handicapped, visually impaired, learning disabilities, speech disorders, and early childhood handicapped. One of the common standards for all of these specialties calls for early laboratory experience with exceptional children as one means of determining the candidate's maturity to work with exceptional children. The standards for specialization areas call for supervised experience in dealing with children in the appropriate area of specialization.

In addition, Georgia has a set of standards for the interrelated teacher. These standards cover various specialties of exceptional children at the elementary grade levels. This applies only for individuals who prepare for a T-5 certificate, and the prerequisite is preparation to qualify for a T-4 certificate in early childhood, elementary, or special education. The program standards are written in terms of certification requirements, i.e., they are not generic in terms of competencies. The program standards require 20 to 25 hours in various special education topics and a methods-practicum of 15 to 25 hours.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The two sets of standards are very close in language, dealing with competencies and not course credits. The Georgia Standards do specify the desirability that the program include organized travel to where the language is spoken, and college classroom teaching in the target language.

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Both sets of standards deal with competencies, and not required course credits. The NASDTEC Standards are for physical education programs. The Georgia Standards are for health and physical education programs. However, the Georgia Standards recognize the possibility of two areas of specialization by specifying (1) general competencies of health and physical education teachers for both specialties (at all grade levels) and (2) separate competencies for teachers of school health and for teachers of physical education. The Georgia general competencies in (1) and the physical education competencies in (2) cover the same competencies as the NASDTEC physical education standards, although the Georgia Standards are somewhat more detailed. For example, the NASDTEC Standards speak of a competency in "a wide variety of physical activities such as fundamental motor skills and exercise, gymnastics, individual and dual sports, team sports and games, mass games and activities, rhythms and dance, camping and outdoor recreation." The Georgia Standards list the same areas and add such items as isometric and isotonic exercises, aquatics, track and field experiences, etc. First aid, safety, understanding of underlying physical development of students, maintenance of supplies and equipment, development of intramural and interscholastic programs are competencies mentioned by both sets of standards. The Georgia Standards also specifically mention the secondary school physical education teacher roles in coaching.

HEALTH EDUCATION

Most of the competencies mentioned by the two sets of standards are the same. The Georgia Standards also specify that the program should offer exposure to community health programs, and ability to guide young people into health careers. The Georgia Standards specify that the health education staff should meet the general education requirements for all teachers and also be qualified in health education.

HOME ECONOMICS
(Georgia = Home Economics and Family Life)

The Georgia Standards call for a minimum of a year's study in each of the following: (1) family and child development, including observation in nursery programs, (2) textiles and clothing construction, (3) food and nutrition, (4) housing management and family economics. The NASDTEC Standards call for competencies in these areas but no minimum amount of study time is mentioned for each area.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS

Both standards call for competencies and not specific course requirements. The enumerated competencies are fairly similar. The NASDTEC Standards include a competency in management of industrial arts programs and explicitly mention the ability to communicate via drawings and a knowledge of the metric system. The Georgia Standards specify that the program must include at least one person with a doctorate in industrial arts.

MATHEMATICS

The Georgia and NASDTEC Standards are both stated in competencies, rather than required credit hours. There is some variation in how these competencies are described. The NASDTEC Standards call for competencies "which are relevant to the school curriculum, for example, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, analytic geometry, calculus, probability and statistics." The Georgia Standards call for substantial advanced study in algebra and geometry, since these are the primary high school math courses. The Georgia Standards further enumerate specific subject areas to be covered: linear algebra, vectors, matrices, development of Euclidean geometry, differential equations, probability and statistics, theory of numbers, set theory, etc. The NASDTEC Standards call for a laboratory experience of "working with pupils of both high and low academic abilities" and "shall provide experience with mathematics model building." The Georgia Standards add that "it is highly desirable" that the staff of the department of mathematics who teach education majors "be interested in teacher education."

MEDIA SPECIALISTS
(NASDTEC = Library Media)

The Georgia Standards relate to all media. For an MS-4 (which is no longer issued in Georgia) a prerequisite is completion of the requirements for a T-4 or professional teaching certificate. The NASDTEC Standards require inclusion of the teacher professional education standards in the media curricula. The Georgia Media MS-4 Standards specify a minimum of 40 hours in media courses. The MS-5 requires 60 quarter hours.

Although the NASDTEC title imples "Library," the competencies discussed cover all media. Both sets of standards list competencies relating to

selection and utilization of materials, design and production, technical processing, administration and management of media services, information sources, and a practicum.

MUSIC

Both sets of standards relate to competencies and not specific course requirements. The Georgia Standards are somewhat more specific. For example, they state, "The student shall be able to sing at sight harmony parts in a SATB choral arrangement." The NASDTEC Standards specify "basic score reading." The Georgia Standards call for performance "at an acceptable level in public at least one solo selection and one ensemble selection from the standard concert repertoire." The NASDTEC Standards call for proficiency on an instrument "sufficiently advanced for demonstration and accompaniment" and "ability to perform in large ensembles and a variety of small ensembles." The Georgia Standards call for ability to acceptably conduct Class B music. The NASDTEC Standards call for experiences "which develop the knowledge and skills necessary to conduct instrumental as well as choral ensembles." The Georgia Standards provide for three concentrations: choral, instrumental, and elementary school music. The NASDTEC Standards specify the choral and instrumental routes.

SCIENCE
(Georgia Standards - 1969)

The Georgia Standards are generally more specific about the length of study the program must include in various sciences, rather than enumerating basic competencies as the NASDTEC Standards do. Both sets of standards emphasize the need for high school science teachers to specialize in one science. The Georgia Standards indicate consideration be given to develop joint programs in two science

specialties, or in one science specialty and in mathematics. The Georgia Standards identify general science programs (all specialties) as applying below the tenth grade level.

Biology

Georgia Standards specify the biology courses should be approximately one-quarter of total undergraduate courses. A full year of physics is specified as well as a full year of chemistry. Also, basic principles of mathematics including elementary statistics are to be mastered. The NASDTEC Standards call for studies that emphasize the relationship with biology, such as chemistry (including introductions to organic chemistry and biochemistry), physics, paleontology, behavior, and mathematics.

Chemistry

The Georgia Standards specify approximately one-quarter of undergraduate course work to be in chemistry. Both sets of standards specify inclusion of organic, inorganic, analytical, and physical chemistry content. The Georgia Standards call for one year each in biology and in physics, and math through calculus. NASDTEC Standards call for basic knowledge of physics, biology, and math, including a working knowledge of calculus.

Earth and Space Sciences

The Georgia Standards call for approximately one-quarter of undergraduate courses in earth and space sciences. A four-week field experience is required and lab work in the four sub-areas of earth sciences is specified. Also, upper division course work is specified in at least one of the four earth science areas. The NASDTEC Standards call for "emphasis on field work." The Georgia Standards call for approximately one-quarter of undergraduate courses leading to a basic understanding of biology, chemistry, math, and physics. Lab work is required in

biology, chemistry, and physics courses. Math is required through calculus. The NASDTEC Standards call for preparation in biology, chemistry, physics, and mathematics.

General Science

The Georgia Standards specify these programs are for teachers below the tenth grade. The standards call for one year's work in lab studies in each of the following areas: biology (including botany), physics, chemistry, mathematics (including introduction to calculus), and earth sciences. Additionally, electives are called for in physics or chemistry and earth sciences. The NASDTEC Standards call for knowledge of basic principles of biology, chemistry, physics, and earth sciences, and concentration in one of these. The NASDTEC Standards stress that the program should include lab experience with junior high school students.

Physics

The Georgia Standards call for approximately one-quarter of total undergraduate courses to be in physics. The content of introductory, intermediate, and modern physics courses is enumerated. Additionally, one year of study is suggested for each of the following: chemistry, biology, math (through calculus and differential equations), plus additional work in earth science.

The Georgia Standards encourage joint programs in mathematics and science (30 quarter hours in mathematics plus 35 in the science) or two sciences with a minimum of 35 quarter hours in each science. The Georgia Standards for the sciences are more specific than the NASDTEC Standards.

SOCIAL SCIENCES
(Georgia - 1978)

Georgia Standards call for specific numbers of course credits in various social sciences in addition to a description of general competencies. The NASDTEC Standards are in terms of general competencies in the various social sciences. The Georgia Standards enumerate five social science areas: history, political science, eocnomics, geography, and the behavioral sciences (sociology, anthropology, and psychology). Programs are to include courses in three of these areas plus a concentration in one of the three. Field-based experience, in addition to student teaching, is encouraged. The concentration area requires 40 quarter credit hours and a minimum of 20 quarter hours total in the other areas. Of the total 60 quarter hours, 30 quarter hours must be upper division courses. For each specialty area, the Georgia Standards also specify required credit hours in specific subjects. For example, 5 quarter hours in constitutional law for political science, or 10 quarter hours in U.S. history for history.

The NASDTEC Standards relate to programs that are broad-based across the social sciences, or to majors in one social science with additional work in the other social sciences. The five competency areas to be covered, either broadly or in conjunction with a major in one of them, are: history, political science, economics, sociology and cultural anthropology, and geography. The NASDTEC Standards emphasize the interdisciplinary approach. Both sets of standards address the need to be able to handle controversial topics in the classroom. The Georgia Standards admonish program advisers that Georgia's certification requirements call for a minimum of 10 quarter hours in a single area of social studies, for teaching in that area.

GEORGIA CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTED FIELDS

(For comparison with certification requirements of other states)

Elementary Teachers

Approved program

General education component:	60 qtr hrs.
Prof. education courses:	30 qtr hrs, minimum of 10 each in foundations (to include course on exceptional children), curriculum, & methods specific to age level, and student teaching.
Teaching field requirements--	Not spelled out for elementary education, except that a course in the teaching of reading is required.

Early Childhood (K-4)

Teaching field requirement:	45 qtr hrs in communication arts (incl. teaching of reading), socio-behavioral studies, science and math, arts and humanities, and health and physical education, with no more than 10 qtr hrs in any of the above areas. Courses must cover subject area appropriate to young children.

Middle Grades (4-8)

Teaching field requirement:	45 qtr hrs with depth in at least two teaching areas applicable to middle grades. Primary concentration to have a minimum of 25 qtr hrs (incl. teaching of reading) in one of the following: language arts, science, social studies, and mathematics. Specific content is spelled out for each of these areas. Secondary concentration: 20 qtr hrs/½ upper division in one of the listed areas or in art, music, health-phys. ed, and career education.

Professional Education Requirements for High School Teachers:	Same as for all teachers: 30 qtr hrs (see elementary).

High School Teachers

Teaching Field Requirements:

Math:	45 qtr hrs, 5 each algebra, geom. & calculus, and no more than 10 in physics

Science:	
Comprehensive:	45 qtr hrs., minimum 10 each physics, chem., and biology.
Single field:	40 qtr hrs in that field except that a maximum of 10 qtr hrs may be in specified related science.
Social Science:	
Comprehensive:	75 qtr hrs total (30 upper division) 15 each in 3 of 5 areas 30 in a 4th area (½ upper division). If this is the behav. sci. concentration, it must include 5 each in sociol., psych., and anthropology. The history concentration must include 10 qtr hrs U.S. history.
Single field (except Behav. Sci.):	40 qtr hrs, with minimum of 10 U.S. history for the history field, and other specific requirements for the other disciplines.
Behav. Sci.:	80 qtr hrs, incl. 60 in sociol., psych. and anthropology; and concentration of 40 qtr hrs in one area + 10 in two other areas + 20 in econ., geog., hist., and pol. sci.
Foreign Languages:	
Modern	40 qtr hrs (incl. 10 maximum h.s. credits)
Ancient	30 qtr hrs (incl. 10 maximum h.s. credits)
	For both--minimum 20 qtr hrs upper division.

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
(ICP STATES)

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Alabama	60 sem. hrs. general ed. 72 sem. hrs. prof. studies to include 12 in elem. school curric. areas, 6 in reading & 9 internship	Same as elem. except prof. studies to include 30 hrs. in early childhood curric. areas.	Same as elem. except to include teaching field, curric. & teaching media-9 sem. hrs. Teaching field: at least 2 fields of 27 sem. hrs., or a comprehensive field.	33 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. to include reading & internship-9 sem. hrs.
California	Approved program to include 1 full-time sem. student teaching, includes reading course, and training in special ed.	See elem. educ.	See elem. educ.	See elem. educ.
Connecticut	75 sem. hrs. in gen. ed., including English, science, math, soc. sci. (& U.S. History), & fine arts. 30 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. to include reading course- sem. hrs., supervised teaching-at least 6 sem. hrs.	Endorsement for N-3	or 4-8th grades depending on program preparation	18 sem. hrs. in prof. ed.-6 sem. hrs. student teaching.
Delaware	Approved program in elem. ed., or 45 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. courses w/ 6 sem. hrs. student teaching in 1-8 grades; reading course required-6 sem. hrs.	Program in early childhood or 48 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. to include early childhood curric. content & methods-24 sem. hrs. & student teaching in K-3, 6 hrs.		Approved teacher ed. program, or 15 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. to include student teaching
District of Columbia	46 sem. hrs. gen. ed. w/ course hrs. specified in each subject, plus courses in elem. ed.: includes reading, educ. psych., methods, math for elem. teachers, speech & lang. for teachers, student teaching	Program in early childhood, minimum 18 sem. hrs. in early childhood courses including child develop., curric., methods, student teaching		Prof. preparation courses including student teaching.

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Florida	45 sem. hrs. gen ed. over 5 maj. areas. 21 sem. hrs. specialization-elem. ed. incl. ea. lit., sci., soc. st., phys. ed., art, music & arith. 20 sem. hrs. profess. ed. to incl. 6 ea. found. & methods & student teaching. Reading course req. or, maj. elem. ed.	Maj. in early child. or cert. in elem. ed. requirements + 6 sem. hrs. spec. K-N methods & observation	Comphrehensive: 12 sem. hrs. in each - Eng., math, sci. & soc. st. with specified subject matter. Single field: 18 sem hrs. English, sci. soc. st., 12 sem. hrs. (math)	20 sem. hrs. prof. ed. incl. 2 sem. hrs. method of teach. certif. sub. 6 sem. hrs. student teaching
Hawaii	Approved program			Approved program
Idaho	42 sem. hrs. gen. ed. to cover specific broad areas (must include 6 in fundamental arithmetic); 24 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. to include 6 sem. hrs. in student teaching in elem. grades	Same as elem., w/student teaching in K-3.		20 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. to include 6 sem. hrs. in student teaching
Indiana	70 sem. hrs. gen. ed. & subject matter content 30 sem. hrs. prof. ed., to include 9 wks. student teaching, & 6 sem. hrs. in reading course	Same, except to include 30 sem. hrs. in content & skills related to K-3 instruction & 40 sem. hrs. in gen. ed.	27 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include reading, 9 wks. student teaching in jr. h.s., +24 sem. hrs. in a sub. area + 18 sem. hrs. in a supporting area	24 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include 9 wks. of student teaching
Kentucky	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Maine	Approved program in elem. ed. or liberal ed. to equal 50% of undergrad. + 30 sem. hrs. prof. ed. courses including 6 hrs. supervised student teaching	Approved program in jr. high prep. (discontinued after 1972)		18 sem. hrs. of which 6 hrs. in student teaching

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Maryland	Approved program in elem. ed. or 80 sem. hrs. in gen. ed., + 26 sem. hrs. planned program in elem. ed. to include methods of teaching reading & 8 sem. hrs. in student teaching	Same as elem. except planned program in early childhood w/ student teaching in N-3.		Approved program or 18 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. including 6 sem. hrs. in student teaching in subject area
Massachusetts	18 sem. hrs. elem. ed. includ. 2 sem. hrs. student teach. & courses in at least 2 of the following areas: educ. psych., philo. of educ., methods & materials & curriculum development courses must deal in elem. ed. (until 1982)	Same as elem.		12 sem. hrs. includ. 2 sem. hrs. student teaching and courses in at least 2 areas as listed in elem. ed. course must deal with adolescent and sec. ed.
Michigan	50 sem. hrs. gen. ed. 20 sem. hrs. prof. ed.-to include 6 sem. hrs. student teaching at level where certif. is sought. Major or minor in field deemed approp. for elem. ed.			20 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include 6 sem. hrs. student teaching
Nebraska	Approved program completion. Standards for approved program specify 30 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. Prof. ed. standards are in terms of competencies and subject areas to be covered.	Same as elem.		(Not available-standards at printers)
New Hampshire	Approved program completion	Same as elem.		Approved program completion
New Jersey	Approved program or 45 sem. hrs. gen. ed. w/ areas specified that must be included; 24 sem. hrs. prof. ed. (+ 6 sem. hrs. teaching of reading) to include elem. subject areas & student teaching	Same as elem., except prof. ed. courses to include N-K subject areas		Approved program or 15 sem. hrs. prof. ed. + student teaching + 6 sem. hrs. teaching reading course

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
New York	24 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including 6 sem. hrs. in reading + student teaching. Academic concentration: English 30; Foreign 24; math 18; soc. studies 30; gen. sci. 36 (in at least 2 sciences)			12 sem. hrs. prof. educ. + student teaching
North Carolina	20-25% of 4-yr program to meet prof. ed. competencies & 75% in subject matter preparation. Competencies in elem. curric. areas are listed. Included is understanding of process of learning to read.	Same	Intermediate teacher to have subject concentration appropriate for middle grades	Describes prof. ed. competencies
Ohio	60 sem. hrs. gen. ed. to be spread over 7 areas + electives w/ content appropriate to elem. curric. 29 sem. hrs. prof. ed. w/ suggested minimum in 3 areas, including teaching of reading & student teaching	Same, except to include 6 sem. hrs. in methods for early childhood level & student teaching in K-primary level.		21 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include student teaching in subject area
Oklahoma	50 sem. hrs. gen. ed. to cover specified areas including reading 21 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including 6 sem. hrs. student teaching, of which 4 must be in elem. school, & includes excep. child course 25 sem. hrs. in specialized ed. across elem. curric.	Same, except must include 2 sem. hrs. practicum, & 6 sem. hrs. in early childhood growth & development		21 sem. hrs. prof. ed. includes 6 sem. hrs. in student teaching in subject area
Pennsylvania	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Rhode Island	30 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. courses approved for elem. school teachers. No less than 6 or more than 12 sem. hrs. in practicum		6 sem. hrs. in methods of teaching middle grades. Elem. teachers must meet 12 sem. hrs. in an academic discipline for endorsement to middle grades.	18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include 6 in practice teaching
South Dakota	Approved program or 30 sem. hrs. in gen. ed.; 26 sem. hrs. prof. ed. courses include 6 sem. hrs. student teaching, & teaching of reading; 29 sem. hrs. in subject areas, w/ specific subjects itemized	Same, except 12 sem. hrs. in early childhood courses & student teaching in K-primary grades		Approved program or 23 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including 6 sem. hrs. student teaching
Utah	Approved program concept. 20% of credits to be in prof. ed. courses. Competencies listed include teaching of reading. 6 sem. hrs. of student teaching required; 30% of total credits to be in approved matter in teaching fields	Same, except student teaching in K-primary grades	Approved program. At least 54 qtr. hrs. in subjects taught: 36 in a primary area & 18 in sec. area, or 27 qtr. hrs. in 2 fields, or 18 in 3 supporting fields. Fields must be among itemized list taught in 5-9.	Approved program or not less than 17% of total program, to include teaching of reading competency & 6 sem. hrs. student teaching
Vermont	On the basis of standards that consist of described competencies. Included is competency of teaching of reading, requiring 9 credit hrs.			Approved program; must include 6 hrs. in teaching of reading
Virginia	48 sem. hrs. gen. ed., specified areas & hrs. are specified; 18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include 6 sem. hrs. student teaching in K or 1-3 or 4-7; 57 sem. hrs. specialized courses in elem. curric. including 6 sem. hrs. in reading & experience w/ excep. children	Practicum in K-3		15 sem. hrs. prof. ed.

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Washington	Approved program method. Recommended pattern: 35% broad liberal arts, 35% subject matter specialization, & 20% prof. studies, w/ at least 1 area of emphasis in an acad. field. 8 wks. supervised practicum.			Approved program method
West Virginia	40 sem. hrs. gen. ed.; 53 sem. hrs. elem. area specialization to include 6 sem. hrs. in reading course & 20 sem. hrs. prof. ed. Minimum "C" required in each area of study & testing by each instn., & recommendation by supervisor of clinical experience.	Same except 39 sem. hrs. early childhood prof. ed., & 32 sem. hrs. in academic concentration.		20 sem. hrs. prof. ed.
Wisconsin	Approved program, 26 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include 5 sem. hrs. student teaching & beginning 1981 must have excep. child course, & teaching of reading	Same as elem. except student teaching in N-K		Approved program 18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including 5 sem. hrs. student teaching

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
(Non-ICP States)

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Alaska	Approved program concept w/ endorsement by program.....			Approved program
Arizona	45 sem. hrs. gen. ed. (2 English courses, 1 U.S. History, 1 gen. psych., 1 soc. or behav. sci., 2 humanities & arts, 1 sci. & 1 math) 30 sem. hrs. in a major or 18 in major & 12 in minor 24 sem. hrs. in prof. ed. to include specified subjects, methods in reading, & student teaching			22 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include student teaching
Arkansas	n/a		18 sem. hrs. in subject area + 3 sem. hrs. of human develop. in approp. age span	18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including 5 sem. hrs. in student teaching
Colorado	Approved program, with competencies listed			Approved program, competencies listed
Illinois	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Iowa	Approved program, includes student teaching	Approved program-student teaching in K or pre-K	Approved program-student teaching in middle school level	Approved program
Kansas	50 sem. hrs. gen. ed. 24 sem. hrs. prof. ed. (including 5 sem. hrs. student teaching). 15 sem. hrs. specialized content & methods, including 6 sem. hrs. reading course. As of 1981: 2 sem. hrs. except. children course.		Same as elem. + endorsement in 2 fields, each requiring 18 sem. hrs.	20 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including 5 sem. hrs. in student teaching.

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Louisiana	46 sem. hrs. gen. ed. 24 sem. hrs. prof. ed. (at least 6 sem. hrs. in student teaching at elem. level), & must have course in excep. children & teaching of reading. 21 sem. hrs. in specialized elem. ed. areas, such as children's lit., LA history-3 sem. hrs.	Student teaching in K or N; 27 sem. hrs. in specified early childhood subjects, including teaching of reading + 18 sem. hrs. home ec.		18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including 6 sem. hrs. student teaching in subject area
Minnesota	Approved program in elem. ed.	30 sem. hrs. in approved program in elem. ed. to include a course in K ed.; ¼ of student teaching in K	Approved program for middle grades (18 sem. hrs.); for elem. teachers it includes 8 sem. hrs. in a single subject field & remedial reading	18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. of which 4 are in student teaching
Mississippi	48 sem. hrs. gen. ed. w/ very specific course requirements, e.g., 3 sem. hrs. in career awareness & 3 sem. hrs. in math to include real number system; 21 sem. hrs. basic prof. ed.-includes reading course. 18 sem. hrs. in specialized ed. in elem. subjects	30 sem. hrs. prof. ed. includes 6 sem. hrs. student teaching below 1st grade. Course requirements are specific to N-K.		21 sem. hrs. prof. ed. of which 6 are in student teaching in subject field
Missouri	53 sem. hrs. gen. ed., includes courses specific to elem. ed. (e.g., math for elem. grades) 18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. courses, includes reading course and excep. children, & 5 sem. hrs. in student teaching.			18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include 5 sem. hrs. in student teaching.
Montana	Approved elem. program including student teaching (approx. 30 sem. hrs. in prof. preparation credits)			Approved program

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Nevada	Approved program to include 6 sem. hrs. teaching of reading, or prof. ed.: 30 sem. hrs., including 8 sem. hrs. supervised teaching, 8 sem. hrs. in methods & 6 sem. hrs. in reading skills			Approved program, or 22 sem. hrs. prof. ed., including 8 sem. hrs. student teaching & course in methods & materials of subject taught
New Mexico	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
North Dakota	20 sem. hrs. in ed. courses to include student teaching 9 wks.	. . . . .		
Oregon	36 qtr. hrs. elem. teacher prep courses including sup. teaching, and 6 qtr. hrs. teaching reading. 60 qtr. hrs. to cover elem. instructional content. General educ. to equal 1/3 of underg. program			30 qtr. hrs. to include student teaching
South Carolina	42-45 sem. hrs. basic ed., various areas specified w/ needed hrs. per area; 21 sem. hrs. prof. ed. in various areas, including teaching of reading, & 6 sem. hrs. student teaching; 18 sem. hrs. in specialized elem. content areas	Same as elem. except 24 sem. hrs. prof. ed.	39-44 sem. hrs. gen. ed. w/ areas specified & hrs. indicated; 24 sem. hrs. prof. ed. includes teaching of reading; 6 sem. hrs. practicum in middle grades, curriculum & methods; 12 sem. hrs. in academic area that pertains to middle grades	18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. courses w/ no more than 3 in special methods & to include 6 in student teaching

	Elementary	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	High School Professional Education Requirements
Tennessee	60 qtr. hrs. gen. ed. w/ areas to be covered; 36 qtr. hrs. prof. ed. includes 3 qtr. hrs. excep. child course; 89 qtr. hrs. specialized ed. courses to include 6 qtr. hrs. student teaching, 3 qtr. hrs. reading course. Content in various areas spelled out, some of which may be covered in gen. ed.	Same as elem. except child development course; Methods & mater. for K, & student teaching in K-3		36 qtr. hrs. prof. ed. including 3 qtr. hrs. excep. child. course & 6 qtr. hrs. student teaching
Texas	60 sem. hrs. gen. ed. (includes Tex. govt.) & areas specified 36 sem. hrs. acad. specializ. of which 18 sem. hrs. to relate to elem. curric. areas (18 areas are listed) 30 sem. hrs. prof. ed. courses to include 6 sem. hrs. student teaching.	60 sem. hrs. gen. ed.; 60 sem. hrs. lab. prior to student teaching; 24 sem. hrs. specializ. area + 12 sem. hrs. in related subjects; 30 sem. hrs. prof. ed. (includes reading course & 6 sem. hrs. student teaching in 1-3)	60 sem. hrs. gen. ed.; 2-24 sem. hrs. teaching fields or one 48 sem. hr. teaching field; 18 sem. hrs. prof. development, includes 6 sem. hrs. student teaching	18 sem. hrs. prof. ed. to include 6 sem. hrs. student teaching
Wyoming	40 sem. hrs. gen. ed.; 24 sem. hrs. prof. ed. including excep. child. & teaching reading, & student teaching; 24 sem. hrs. specialized content, methods & materials to cover each area		Approved program, or for sec. & elem. teachers: 3 courses applicable to middle school (child develop., curric., guidance)	24 sem. hrs. prof. ed.

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS IN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES FOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS
(ICP STATES)

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
Alabama	27 sem. hrs. in 2 fields or a comprehensive field (1/3 upper division courses)	Comprehensive: 52 sem. hrs. w/ 12 sem. hrs. in each of 4 major areas; or 27 sem. hrs. in 2 fields	Comprehensive: 15 sem. hrs. history, 9 sem. hrs. pol. sc., 6 sem. hrs. in each of ec., sociol., geog., 3 sem. hrs. psych., & 9 sem. hrs. soc. sci. electives; or 27 sem. hrs. in 2 fields	33 sem. hrs.
California	approved program	see "math"	see "math"	see "math"
Connecticut	18 sem. hrs.	18 sem. hrs. for each spec. field taught; 12 sem. hrs. for any second science taught; Gen. Sci.: 21 sem. hrs., at least a course in 3 areas, & at least 12 sem. hrs. in one	History: 18 sem. hrs. to include U.S. & European hist. & soc. sci.: 30 sem. hrs., to include U.S. & European history, balance in at least 3 areas	18 sem. hrs. + 6 sem. hr. intro. course, or via proficiency
Delaware	Program in teacher ed. in math, or major in math, or 30 sem. hrs. math	Program in teacher ed. in sci., or major in a sci., or 42 sem. hrs. for chemistry, incl. 3 phys., etc. 45 sem. hrs. for physics, incl. 3 chem., etc. 39 sem. hrs. for earth sci., incl. 3 chem., etc. 39 sem. hrs. for biol., incl. 3 chem., etc.	Program in teacher ed. in soc. sci., or major in soc. sci. w/ courses in 4 of the major discip., or 36 sem. hrs. total in 5 of the major areas	Major or 30 sem. hrs.

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
District of Columbia	30 sem. hrs. in discip. include 3 sem. hrs. ea. in differ. & adv. calculus, algebra, geom., and stat./probabil.	30 sem. hrs. in discip. Gen. sci. (grades 7-9): to include credits in biol., chem. & phys.	30 sem. hrs. in discip. incl.: 18 hist. (6 Amer. Hist.), 3 Am. govt., 6 geog., 3 in any of others	30 sem. hrs. in subject taught
Florida	Maj. or 21 sem. hrs. incl. cal., or certif. in phys. + 15 sem. hrs. math., incl. calculus	Single field: 20 sem. hrs. in field to be taught, or certif. in 1 of the other sciences +16 sem. hrs. in the field to be taught	Comphre: maj. in a soc. sci.& credits in at least 4 separate fields or 30 sem. hrs. incl. 6 ea. U.S. hist. or other hist., U.S. govt., geog., & 3 each econ. & socio. Hist: 24 sem. hrs. hist. & soc. sci. incl. 6 U.S. hist., 9 other hist. & 3 U.S. govt. Other fields: 18 sem. hrs. in soc. sci. incl. 12 in sub. taught, or maj. in field.	Major or 24 sem. hrs.
Hawaii	Follows competency requirements NASDTEC Standards	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Idaho	30 sem. hrs. major + 20 sem. hrs. minor, or 45 sem. hrs. in major incl. algebra, geom., & trig.	30 sem. hrs. major + 20 sem. hrs. minor, or 45 sem. hrs. major. Gen. sci. to include physical, biol. & earth sci.; physical sci. to include 8 sem. hrs. ea. chem. & phys.; biol. sci. to include 6 sem. hrs. each botany & zoology	30 sem. hrs. major + 20 sem. hrs. minor, or 45 sem. hrs. major. Soc. St. includes 3 sem. hrs. Am. govt. & 6 U.S. history; History includes same + remaining hrs. in hist. & pol. sci.	30 sem. hrs. major & 20 sem. hrs. minor, or 45 sem. hrs. major
Indiana	34 sem. hrs., w/ indiv. courses specified, 24 sem. hrs. if minor	51 sem. hrs.: 12 gen. sci. background, 24 primary subject, 12 supporting subject; 24 sem. hrs. if minor	52 sem. hrs.: 18 primary subject & 12 in 2 support. subjects; 24 sem. hrs. if minor	36 sem. hrs. major + 6 sem. hrs. basic or h.s. equiv. or competency or 24 sem. hrs. minor
Kentucky	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Maine	30 sem. hrs. major + 18 sem. hrs. minor, or 50 sem. hrs. in subject area	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
Maryland	Approved program, or 24 sem. hrs., but 18 sem. hrs. if composed of generally recognzd college content	24 sem. hrs. in one sci. to teach one sci.; gen. sci.: 36 sem. hrs. to include 18 in one sci. and 6 ea. in other sciences	Social studies: 36 sem. hrs. incl. 18 sem. hrs. hist. (6-U.S.), 6 sem. hrs. econ., one course ea. in other soc. sci.; History: 24 sem. hrs. (6-U.S.); Geog.: 24 sem. hrs. provided soc. studies teacher w/ 15 sem. hrs. in geog. may teach it	24 sem. hrs., except 18 sem. hrs. if 2 or more yrs. of the lang. in h.s.
Massachusetts	18 sem. hrs. (until 1982)	18 sem hrs. in subject field	18 sem. hrs. in subject field or fields	18 sem. hrs. in subject field or fields
Michigan	Major of at least 30 sem. hrs., or a group major of 36 sem. hrs.; minor of 20 sem. hrs. or a group minor of 24 sem. hrs.	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Nebraska	Program approval method. Programs must meet standards that specify min. hrs. (Standards now at printer's)	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
New Hampshire	Program approval method. NASDTEC Standards, competencies only	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
New Jersey	Approved program method, or 24 sem. hrs. to include alg., geom. & calculus	Approved program or: comprehensive: 30 sem. hrs. to include biol., chem. & phys. Single sci. (biol., earth or physical sci.): 24 sem. hrs. in the single area	Approved program or: 30 sem. hrs. to include Am. hist., European hist., govt., econ., sociology & geog.	Approved program or 24 sem. hrs.

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
New York	18 sem hrs.	36 sem. hrs., 15 sem. hrs. in sc. to be taught Gen. sc: at least 2 scs. to be included	36 sem. hrs.	24 sem. hrs.
North Carolina	Not specified. 25-40% of total credits to be in area of concentration. NT% required	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Ohio	20 sem. hrs. incl. analytic geom. & calculus (8 sem. hrs. suggested), & post-calculus courses (12 sem. hrs. suggested)	Comprehensive: 60 sem. hrs. to cover biol., physical sci. & earth sci. w/ labs; Single field: 20 sem. hrs. in ea., + work in one of the others	Comprehensive: 60 sem. hrs. distrib. over specified 5 areas incl. U.S. hist., suggests 20 sem. hrs. in history. History: 30 sem. hrs. to include U.S. history	Ancient: 20 sem. hrs. Others: 30 sem. hrs.
Oklahoma	18 sem. hrs.	22 sem. hrs., some work in both biol. & physical sci.	22 sem. hrs. in soc. studies w/ coverage over enumerated various soc. sci. areas	24 sem. hrs.
Pennsylvania	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rhode Island	18 sem. hrs.	Gen. sci.: 24 sem. hrs. to include 6 ea. in biol., phys. & chem. Single field: 24 sem. hrs. of which 18 sem. hrs. to be in that field	36 sem. hrs. to include 18 in history	18 sem. hrs.
South Dakota	Major in academic field	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
Utah	Approved teaching major & minor, or composite major; a teaching major is 30 sem. hrs. in one subject, ½ upper div. courses; teaching minor is 16 sem. hrs.: composite major = 46 sem. hrs. in 2 or more related subjects taught in Utah schools	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Vermont	NASDTEC-AAAS guidelines & standards	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Virginia	27 sem. hrs. to include calculus & anal. geom., modern alg., geom., prob./stat.	Gen. Sci. (8-9 grades): 24 sem. hrs. to include 3 or 4 major areas. Single sci.: 24 sem. hrs., except physics-20 sem. hrs. & yr. in other sci. & math (biol. & chem. require inclusion of physics courses)	Hist. & soc. sci.: 42 sem. hrs., w/ 18 in hist., 12 govt., 6 each geog. & econ. Hist.: 24 sem. hrs. in at least 2 areas (sep. course in econ. required) Other Single Subjects: 18 sem. hrs. (sep. course in econ. required)	30 sem. hrs. incl. h.s. credit Latin: 24 sem. hrs. 2nd lang.: 24 sem. hrs.
Washington	Approved program-academic major	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
West Virginia	30 sem. hrs. w/ competencies listed	Gen. Sci.: 24 sem. hrs., competencies listed. Single sci.: 24 sem. hrs., competencies listed	48 sem. hrs., competencies listed	24 sem. hrs., may include h.s. credits
Wisconsin	34 sem. hrs. major, or teaching major w/ teaching minor of 22 sem. hrs.	Broad sci.: 34 sem. hrs., incl. 14 in 2 areas ea. + 8 in remaining 2 areas. To teach specialty in phys. sci.: 44 sem. hrs. w/ 22 ea. in a sci. if major in other sci. or math	Comprehensive: 34 sem. hrs. to include 34 major + 20 sem. hrs. in 2 other fields, or 22 sem. hrs. minor + 32 sem. hrs. over 3 other soc. sci., or approved program major & minor	Major of 34 sem. hrs., or teaching major + teaching minor, minor at least 22 sem. hrs.

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS IN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES FOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

(Non-ICP States)

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
Alaska	Endorsement by program	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Arizona	30 sem. hrs. major	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Arkansas	21 sem. hrs., incl. 3 each in calculus, alg. above intermed., & geom., + 12 sem. hrs. electives w/ ½ upper div.	Gen. Sci.: 24 sem. hrs., incl. 6 sem. hrs. each physical sci., biol., earth sci. Physical Sci.: 24 sem. hrs., min. 15-chem., phys. Single Sci.: 24 sem. hrs. w/ requirements in other sciences	(After 9-1-1981) Soc. Studies: 36 sem. hrs., w/ 6 in subject to be taught, must include 12 U.S. hist., 6 world hist., 6 geog., 3 each-econ. & sociol.	21 sem. hrs.-9 upper div.
Colorado	Lists competencies, not hrs.	Lists competencies	Lists competencies	Lists competencies
Illinois	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Iowa	20 sem. hrs.	Comprehensive: 48 sem. hrs., major in one sci. & min. 9 sem. hrs. in 3 sci.; or 12 sem. hrs. in each of 4 sci. Gen. Sci.: 24 sem. hrs. in broad sci., incl. biol. & physical sci. Single Sci.: 20 sem. hrs. in field, or 24 broad sci., incl. 12 in the field	Comprehensive: 12 sem. hrs. each hist., sociol., govt., econ., & geog. course; or major in one + 9 in ea. of 3 others, + geog. course. Amer. Govt.: 20 sem. hrs. or 24 sem. hrs. in broad area incl. 12 Am. govt. Other specific soc. sci.: same as for Amer. govt.	20 sem. hrs.
Kansas	18 sem. hrs.; for advanced math assignment-must include anal. geom. & calculus	Gen. Sci.: 24 sem. hrs., incl. 1 lab course each in biol., chem. & physics Single sci.: 24 sem. hrs., incl. 12 in sci. to be taught	U.S. hist., govt. & world hist.: 36 sem. hrs. soc. sci. w/ 12 in subject taught; Other soc. sci.: 36 sem. hrs. soc. sci. w/ 6 in subject taught	Latin: 15 sem. hrs. Modern: 24 sem. hrs.

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
Louisiana	20 sem. hrs., incl. 3 calculus Only 9 sem. hrs. may be freshman math	Gen. Sci.: 24 sem. hrs., min. 6 each major sci. area Single sci.: addnl 8 sem. hrs. in that field	30 sem. hrs., incl. 6 each U.S. hist., world hist., & geog., & 3 each La. hist., U.S. govt., econ., & sociol.	24 sem. hrs., or 18 sem. hrs. if above freshman level
Minnesota	26 sem. hrs., incl. 3 courses in analysis (2 in calc., 1 geom.), 2 courses in abst. alg., 1 in geom. postulations, & 1 found. of math, & 1 course prob./stat.; or an 18 sem. hr. minor, same courses as listed above required	Approved program for 5-9, or 7-12 5-9 broad competencies required 7-12-depth in one area & broad competencies required	Approved program, competencies described	Major, & good or superior rating on 4 MLA competencies & pass rating on 3 MLA competencies, or minor-20 sem. hrs.
Mississippi	24 sem. hrs., incl. 9 sem. hrs. calculus, 3 sem. hrs. each college geom., prob./stat.	32 sem. hrs. in sci. to be taught Gen. sci.: must include 3 sem. hrs. each in earth, chem., & physics	42 sem. hrs. across specified soc. sci., incl. 6 U.S. hist.	24 sem. hrs; 18 sem. hrs. if 2 h.s. units & college study begins at intermed. level
Missouri	30 sem. hrs., 10 above beginning calculus	20 sem. hrs. in sci. to be taught + 10 sem. hrs. in other sciences Gen. Sci. (grades 7-8): 21 sem. hrs., incl. 5 each chem. & physics, & 8-10 sem. hrs. biol.	40 sem. hrs. in soc. studies, incl. 8-10 U.S. hist.; specifies sem. hrs. across other various disciplines	30 sem. hrs., incl. 24 in lang. taught, or 24 sem. hrs. in one lang. 2/ 2 h.s. credits
Montana	Approved program-competencies listed. Major-30 sem. hrs. & minor 20 sem. hrs., or 40 sem. hrs.-one area	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Nevada	36 sem. hrs. major, 24 sem. hrs. minor	Recognized majors/minors Comprehensive: 36 sem. hrs. major & 24 sem. hrs. minor Single field: 30 sem. hrs. major & 16 sem. hrs. minor	Comprehensive: 36 sem. hrs. major & 24 sem. hrs. minor Single field: 30 sem. hrs. major & 16 sem. hrs. minor	30 sem. hrs. major and 16 sem. hrs. minor

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
New Mexico	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
North Dakota	No specific requirements in regulations	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"
Oregon	42 qtr. hrs. to incl. abst. alg., linear alg., geom., anal., prob. & stat. & comp. programming	Gen. sci: 45 qtr. hrs. to incl. 27 in bio. sci., & 18 in phys. & earth sci. 45 qtr. hrs. to incl. 27 in chem. & 18 in phys. or vice versa	45 qtr. hrs. in soc. st. to incl. 24 qtr. hrs. in 3 areas + 6 qtr. hrs. in econ. + 12 qtr. hrs. U.S. hist., + 6 state and local govt. + 6 inter. disc. contemporary issues	45 qtr. hrs.
South Carolina	24 sem. hrs., incl. 6 each alg., anal. geom. & calculus, 3 each mod. geom. & methods of teaching math	Natural sci.: 30 sem. hrs., incl. 6-8 each biol., chem. & Physics Gen. sci.: 18 sem. hrs., incl. 12 total in biol., chem., & physics Single sci.: 12 sem. hrs. (6 in lab courses) Earth sci.: 18 sem. hrs., incl. at least 3 areas of earth sci.	Comprehensive: 30 sem. hrs., incl. 6 each U.S. & European hist. History: 18 sem. hrs., w/ 6 each U.S. & Europ. hist. & govt. Other soc. sci.: 12 sem. hrs.	18 sem. hrs. above introd. course
Tennessee	27 qtr. hrs. college alg., trig., anal. geom.	Comprehensive: 48 qtr. hrs., 3 qtr. hrs. each biol., physics, chem., earth sci. To teach one sci.: 12 sem. hrs. required Single sci.: 24 qtr. hrs., may include survey course Gen. sci.: 24 qtr. hrs. to include 8 each gen. biol. & physical sci.	Comprehensive: 9 qtr. hrs. each U.S. hist. & Europ. hist. + 9 qtr. hrs. to cover 4 areas of other soc. sciences (Endorsement w/ 9 qtr. hrs. in a subject) Single field: 18 qtr. hrs. in subject	Group: 45 qtr. hrs.; w/ h.s. credits-18 qtr. hrs. in lang. taught One lang.: 27 qtr. hrs. + 2 yrs. h.s. credits
Texas	24 sem. hrs. in each of 2 subjects w/ 12 sem. hrs. adv. work in each, or 48 sem. hrs. in a composite field-18 in adv. work	See "math"	See "math"	See "math"

	Mathematics	Science	Social Science	Languages
Wyoming	24 sem. hrs., incl. gen. math, alg., geom., calculus & trig., basic math concepts	30 sem. hrs. distributed over biol., earth sci., physical sci. & math To teach one specialty: 12 sem. hrs. in that field	Comprehensive: 36 sem. hrs.: 6 sem. hrs. Amer. hist., four specified areas must be covered by courses Single field: 12 sem. hrs. in that field as part of the required 36 sem. hrs.	24 sem. hrs.

CONCLUSION

A consideration of changes in current Georgia certification procedures must address two important issues: (1) safeguarding the quality of Georgia's teachers, and (2) eliminating barriers to out-of-state applicants where there is sufficient evidence that such applicants are qualified to teach in the State's schools.

Georgia has taken two fundamental steps in recent years to improve the quality of its teachers: (1) the testing of applicants on minimum competencies via the Criterion Referenced Tests, and (2) the performance evaluation of newly hired teachers over a three-year period to assist these new teachers to meet deficiencies, and to prevent the issuance of standard renewable certificates to teachers who cannot perform in the classroom. None of the changes in certification of out-of-state teachers examined in this analysis in any way affects these two steps that Georgia has taken to improve the quality of its teachers.

Although out-of-state applicants may be annoyed about the process of having to resubmit transcripts if already certificated in another state, the underlying issue does not really relate to another round of paperwork. Rather it relates to the subsequent possibility of being required to go back to school even if the applicant had completed an approved teacher education program in another state, or had already taught successfully elsewhere. When the lack of one or another course requirement means that an out-of-state teacher is also paid less than the full professional scale until the courses are completed, this may cause further resentment by the applicant who may not be convinced that such a course will really affect his or her performance.

If Georgia moves to a reciprocity system the basic alteration would be the exoneration of some applicants from having to complete one or another course. The current CRT requirement and the new performance evaluation system for continued certification would not be affected at all. The question then arises whether the quality of teachers employed by Georgia would suffer because certain course requirements would be sacrificed for out-of-state applicants, given that they would still be subject to testing for employment and performance evaluation for

continued employment.

In addition to the new CRT and performance evaluation safeguards, the Georgia Department of Education has been operating under a dual system to check on the preparation of teachers. It approves teacher education programs which must meet State Program Approval Criteria, and then it checks transcripts of applicants to determine if they meet certification requirements. The Program Criteria for the most part do not specify credit hour requirements, presumably reflecting the recognition that the development of quality teachers does not depend on a unique combination of courses. Yet the certification requirements are very specific on the courses and credits that must be completed.

This dual system results in checking transcripts of individuals who completed programs approved by the Georgia Department of Education. Questions are raised by the Department about the courses completed by students who come from an approved program and who are recommended to the Certification Unit by an approved teacher education program. From the Department's prespective, this method of checking for course hours and credits constitutes an auditing procedure of whether approved programs are really meeting the Georgia Criteria. But from the college programs' perspective, the question is raised as to why the State is checking for individual course credits on transcripts if the program was approved in the first place. Such concern would seem to be legitimate on the part of colleges since most program Criteria are not stated in terms of course requirements in the first place, but rather in terms of competencies the programs are to develop.

This dichotomy between approved programs and checking individual transcripts has been an issue for some time. In many states the issue has been resolved by specifying that applicants for certification may meet the requirements either by having been recommended by an approved program or by having met the specific course requirements for certification. The rationale for this approach is that if the state approves a teacher education program, then the state should trust

the college to do what the approved program is designed to do, and if the state does not feel the teacher education program meets the standards, it should not have been approved in the first place.

The Georgia Office of Planning and Budgeting analysis of the Certification process in 1979 made the same suggestions, by recommending that the State Department cease its analysis of transcripts of individuals who completed approved programs. The new Preface to the "Criteria for Approving Teacher Education Programs in Georgia," which comes before the Board of Education in its December 1980 meeting, states: "Students completing approved programs who receive the recommendation of the appropriate college official meet the preparation requirement of performance-based certification listed above. Applicants for certification from any regionally accredited institution which does not have an approved program in the area where the applicants seeks certification will be evaluated for certification against minimum certification standards."

If this Preface is adopted, it would appear that the State Department of Education will cease to evaluate transcripts of individual applicants recommended by Georgia approved programs. Then the educational institution would be responsible for inclusion of the appropriate subject matter in a student's program and, except for the special education course that is mandated by law, the combination of individual courses would cease to be as important as it is today.

Assuming the above new policy is implemented for in-state applicants, then the present policy of reviewing transcripts for specific courses for out-of-state applicants who completed programs approved by other state departments of education would also need to be reviewed. A continued strict adherence to the review of transcripts for all out-of-state applicants from state approved programs would constitute a double standard and signify a lack of trust in the other states' program approval methods and standards.

Of course Georgia is not alone in this implicit distrust of the program review process by other states. In the absence of reciprocity agreements, which were

not developed until 1967, this situation was fairly prevalent across the nation. Knowing its own programs, but not being familiar with other states' programs, a state had a natural reaction to spell out specific course requirements for certification that would apply to graduates of other states' programs.

In recent years, however, there have been moves to overcome distrust of other states' program review processes by allowing reciprocal certification for applicants who completed other states' approved programs. Moreover, some states that are not parties to reciprocity agreements have moved toward making certification simpler (if not automatic) for candidates who completed either NCATE approved programs, or programs that were approved according to the NASDTEC standards.

To some extent this movement towards recognizing the teacher education preparation of out-of-state applicants without detailed reviews of transcripts, is an acknowledgement of the principle that the choice of good teachers does not depend on any given combination of courses. Indeed, the fact that even some in-state teachers who complete a prescribed set of courses do fail the Criterion Referenced Tests is an indication that completion of a given curriculum is no guaranteed protection against teachers who do not qualify. The movement in recent years toward the use of tests to determine the minimum competency of teachers, the greater reliance on performance evaluation prior to extending "permanent" certification to teachers, and the current emphasis on raising admission requirements for students who enter education programs are inherent affirmations throughout the nation of the view that completion of prescribed educational programs per se is no guarantee of producing quality teachers. In the same light, unbending adherence to rigid certification requirements is also no guarantee toward the staffing of schools with good teachers. In view of the lack of proof that application of rigid certification requirements is any guarantee for producing quality staffing, some loosening of these requirements (provided the applicants either finished

approved teacher education programs, or successfully taught a given number of years in other states and passed the appropriate Criterion Referenced Tests) does not appear to pose an undue danger to the quality of Georgia's teachers.

The increased mobility of the population has no doubt contributed to the greater recognition of other states' teacher education programs in the certification process. The need to address out-of-state professional preparation of teachers has also been a reaction to the proliferation of demands by more and more professions for national licensing standards, and to the movement of young people from state to state.

Of the three vehicles available to expedite certification of out-of-state teachers in Georgia (NCATE, NASDTEC and ICP), the ICP system has the most advantages. Compared to NCATE and NASDTEC, it is the only one that provides for reciprocity. With the other two arrangements, Georgia could proceed to expedite applicants completing NCATE and/or NASDTEC programs, but other states would be under no obligation to extend the same privilege to Georgia graduates. Also fewer states are availing themselves of these two options for expediting out-of-state certification than for the use of ICP. Only 14 states indicate they give favorite treatment to graduates of NASDTEC programs, and only 14 states indicate any considerable difference in the treatment of graduates of NCATE programs. Also, with the increased interest in teacher education program reviews (including site visits) by state departments of education as well as state higher education boards throughout the nation, some doubt exists about the continuing importance of the NCATE reviews. Indeed, NCATE has ceased to print in its annual directory a list of states that give favorite treatment to NCATE program applicants for certification. On the other hand, as of July, 1980, 30 states had signed ICP reciprocity agreements with anywhere from one to 27 other states.

Acceptance of the ICP system would not force Georgia to sign a contract with all ICP states. Instead, the State Department of Education could choose to sign with only those states in which it has the greatest confidence as to their program reviews. One criterion for evaluating states' teacher education reviews could be whether or not they use the NASDTEC Standards. Of the ICP states, directors of the following states indicate their standards are the same or equivalent to the NASDTEC Standards: Alabama, California, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington. This list includes three of the states (underlined) that supply a large number of Georgia's out-of-state applicants.

A broad-brush review of the certification requirements of the ICP states that also use the NASDTEC Standards is useful to determine how requirements in these states compare to Georgia's requirements in fields that employ the largest number of teachers. The certification requirements in elementary education for these states specifically call for a teaching-of-reading-skills course except for Idaho, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Washington. However, the NASDTEC Standards for program approval do call for the inclusion of the teaching of reading skills, as well as the ability to recognize special education needs, so that elementary education programs approved by these states should include course content in these areas.

Since the ICP system requires reciprocal certification only where the originating states' requirements are for a field at least as broad as the one applied for in the receiving state, Georgia would not automatically have to certify a teacher certified in a single subject, (e.g. chemistry) who is applying for a general science certificate to teach in Georgia. However, a teacher certified by another state for grades 1-8, as is common in many states, would be entitled to a Georgia Middle Grades certificate, since this does fall within the scope of a broader area certificate. This might produce a problem because of Georgia's

new Middle Grades certification requirements. Among the ICP states using NASDTEC Standards, the following states do have separate certification requirements for middle grades: Alabama, Florida, Indiana, North Carolina, Rhode Island and Utah. Again, this includes three states that are heavy suppliers of out-of-state applicants to Georgia.

The Georgia requirements for "comprehensive" certification in science (General Science) and in the social sciences call for considerable breadth of subjects to be covered in the curriculum. Among the ICP states that use NASDTEC Standards for program approval, the following states do itemize broad subject area requirements to be covered for "comprehensive" certificates, or even for a single field certificate: Alabama, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah and Virginia. Florida is not included because the emphasis in that state, in the sciences, is on preparation in the field to be taught, although the social science requirements do call for the broad coverage in several fields. North Carolina is also not included because the requirements for various fields are not as specific as they are in Georgia. However, the applicants in North Carolina must pass the appropriate National Teacher Examination in order to be certified in any one field.

A further safeguard Georgia should consider in moving to a system of reciprocity certification is to require the Criterion Referenced Tests of all out-of-state applicants, rather than only of those applicants who completed the programs after September 1, 1978. At the present time the out-of-state applicants completing programs before that date are not required to take the Criterion Referenced Tests in order to treat them in the same manner as the Georgia applicants who also need not take the Tests if they graduated prior to that date. While equal treatment for in-state and out-of-state applicants is not only desirable, but probably legally necessary, it is possible that if out-of-state applicants are given some degree of

special consideration via reciprocity (e.g., certain Georgia course requirements that in-state applicants complete might now be sacrificed), then the State of Georgia could require the Criterion Referenced Test of these people as a quid pro quo without violating equal treatment provisions. This issue should be further investigated by legal staff.

In summary, a move by Georgia to sign ICP reciprocity agreements with states that use the NASDTEC Standards would expedite certification for applicants from 21 states and the District of Columbia, including three states that are heavy suppliers of out-of-state teachers in Georgia. Such a move would not pose a threat to quality in view of the fact that 1) NASDTEC Standards are used for program approval. 2) Candidates for Georgia teaching positions would still have to pass the Criterion Referenced Tests, and 3) all newly employed teachers would still be subject to the new performance evaluation system.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON STATE PRACTICES IN CERTIFYING OUT-OF-STATE TEACHERS

(Please respond to only one choice for each question)

1. For teachers who have completed their program in a state other than your own, does the fact that an applicant completed an NCATE-approved program make any difference in the certification process as compared to another applicant who completed a program without NCATE accreditation?

   [a] Yes--that applicant's program is accepted without any other review of transcripts.

   [b] Yes--that applicant's program is accepted only for the field in which the person finished the NCATE-approved program, without any review of transcripts. If the applicant wishes certification in a different field, we still review the transcripts.

   [c] Yes--that person's program does not require the same kind of detailed review of college credits that we would normally use for out-of-state applicants, but we still evaluate the transcripts.

   [d] No--that person is evaluated by us in the same manner as would be true of any other person who completed a program not approved by NCATE.

   [e] We are a party to the Interstate Certification Contracts, so the above alternatives are not applicable for states with which we have reciprocity contracts. For applicants from other states, we follow the practice described in ___ above.

   [f] None of the above. Our procedure is as follows:

2. Do you handle out-of-state applicants who completed teacher education programs that appear on the NASDTEC list of programs in a different manner from other out-of-state applicants who completed programs not on the list?

   [a] Yes--we do not review the transcripts of applicants who completed programs on the NASDTEC list.

   [b] Yes--we do not review the transcripts of applicants who completed programs on the NASDTEC list if they are applying for a certificate in the field for which their program is listed by NASDTEC.

   [c] No--we treat out-of-state applicants in the same way, regardless of whether the program they completed appears on the NASDTEC list.

   [d] We are a party to the Interstate Certification Contracts, so the above alternatives are not applicable for states with which we have reciprocity contracts. For applicants from other states, we follow the practice described in ___ above.

   [e] None of the above. Our procedure is as follows:

3. Do you consider your state program approval standards as being equivalent to the NASDTEC Standards?

   [a] Yes--we consider our standards to be equivalent to NASDTEC standards.

   [b] Yes--we consider our standards to be equivalent to NASDTEC standards, with the following major exceptions:

   [c] No--our standards do not relate to the NASDTEC standards.

   [d] None of the above. Our situation is as follows:

4. Do you have any statewide testing requirements (such as the NTE) for teacher certification applicants?

   [a] Yes--all applicants completing programs after _____ must be tested.

   [b] Yes--all applicants, regardless of when they completed their programs, must be tested.

   [c] No--we have no testing requirements for certification.

5. Do you have similar testing requirements for in-state and out-of-state applicants?

   [a] Yes--the testing requirements are the same for in-state and out-of-state applicants.

   [b] No--all out-of-state applicants are tested, regardless of when they completed programs, but in-state applicants are tested only if they completed programs after_____.

   [c] Not applicable--no testing requirements at all.

   [d] None of the above. Our situation is as follows:

Thank you. Please return this questionnaire to:

Dr. Eva C. Galambos
Research Associate
Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

APPENDIX B

SURVEY ON CERTIFICATION OF OUT-OF-STATE TEACHER APPLICANTS

TEACHER

Please check the one answer ([a], [b], or [c]) that best reflects your views on each item.

I. Automatic certification of out-of-state teachers, provided they take and pass the appropriate Georgia Criterion Reference Test, might mean that some out-of-state teachers would be certified who have not taken certain courses included in the Georgia requirements. For example, it is possible such teachers could have completed out-of-state approved teacher education programs that did not include a special education course.

[a] I have no objection to automatic certification of such out-of-state teachers if they taught satisfactorily in other states, or if they graduated from approved programs in other states with preparation for the field in which they wish certification.

[b] I do not think it would be fair to give automatic certification to such out-of-state applicants because this might include some who have not taken all the same courses I had to take.

II. Out-of-state teachers who have not completed certain Georgia requirements, such as the reading course or the special education course, are now given one-year or provisional certificates. They must complete missing requirements by taking courses in order to qualify for a longer professional certificate.

If Georgia were to change the certification process for out-of-state teachers who completed approved programs, or who had taught several years elsewhere, these requirements for additional course work would be eliminated. However, such applicants would still have to take the Criterion Referenced Test, and be subject to the performance evaluation system that is being established statewide.

[a] I feel it would be worthwhile to expedite the certification process for out-of-state applicants even if it does mean some would not take additional courses. We need these teachers who come from other states.

[b] I do not think we should sacrifice the course requirements for out-of-state teachers even if such requirements do discourage out-of-state applicants. These course requirements are important and help to safeguard the quality of teachers employed in the state.

III. Under a true reciprocity system, if Georgia were to adopt expedited certification procedures for applicants from other states, a Georgia teacher would be accorded the same expedited procedures by these other states if the Georgia teacher in the future chose to apply in these states.

[a] I favor expedited certification procedures for out-of-state teachers provided the same privilege is then accorded to Georgia teachers applying in other states.

[b] I favor certification procedures for out-of-state teachers even if the same privilege is not provided to Georgia teachers applying in other states.

[c] I do not favor any loosening of the certification procedures for out-of-state teachers, regardless of whether Georgia teachers derive any benefits in certification by other states.

Have you taught in out-of-state schools? [] Yes [] No

Please use reverse side for additional comments.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY ON CERTIFICATION OF OUT-OF-STATE TEACHER APPLICANTS
SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPAL

Please check the one answer ([a], [b], or [c]) that best reflects your views on each item.

I. Automatic certification of out-of-state applicants who completed teacher education programs or have taught in other states might mean that some out-of-state teachers would be certified who have not taken certain courses included in the Georgia requirements. For individuals who have passed the Criterion Reference Tests do you feel that sacrificing the evaluation of transcripts and therefore of some courses would have:

[a] a bad effect on the quality of out-of-state teachers our district employs.

[b] no appreciable effect on the quality of out-of-state teachers our district employs.

[c] other (please specify)_____

II. Out-of-state teachers who have not completed certain Georgia requirements (e.g., the reading course, or the special education course) are now given one-year or provisional certifications. They must complete missing requirements by taking courses to qualify for a standard professional certificate.

If Georgia were to change the certification process for out-of-state teachers who completed approved programs, or who had taught several years elsewhere, these requirements for additional course work would be eliminated. Please evaluate the effect of the present additional course requirements on your ability to hire out-of-state applicants.

[a] We have not lost many teachers just because they had to take additional courses for their professional certification in Georgia.

[b] We have lost a considerable number of teachers who were discouraged by the requirement of having to take additional courses to gain their professional certification in Georgia.

III. Automatic certification of out-of-state teachers who complete an approved teacher education program in another state, or who have taught successfully in other states, may increase the number of applicants to teach in Georgia schools. From your perspective in filling teaching positions, how critical is the need to import out-of-state teachers to fill Georgia's classrooms?

[a] We had more problems in filling teaching positions in the last two years than was the case in earlier years, but the problem is not severe enough to change certification procedures for out-of-state applicants.

[b] We had more problems in filling teaching positions in the last two years than was the case in earlier years, and we should do everything possible to expedite the certification process for out-of-state teachers.

[c] We had no more problems in filling teaching positions in the last two years than was the case in earlier years. Therefore changing the certification procedures for out-of-state applicants is not justified from the standpoint of teacher shortages.

IV. If you had real problems in filling teaching positions, please rank the top three fields for which the shortages were most severe: _____
_____
_____

MEMBERS, PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

RICHARD C. OWENS
CHAIRMAN
Chairman, Irwin County
Board of Education

JOYCE ANN BROWN
First Grade Teacher
Fair Oaks Elementary School
Marietta

MARVIN FRALISH
Principal
Stone Mountain High School
Stone Mountain

CARL E. FRANKLIN
Instructor of Physics and Chemistry
Berry Academy
Mount Berry

BILLY BRYANT HAIR
Instructor of Marketing
and Management
Augusta Area Vocational-
Technical School
Augusta

J. DONALD HAWK
Professor of Professional
Laboratory Experiences
Georgia Southern College
Statesboro

CARY D. HOLT
Secondary Teacher
Walter F. George High School,
E.J. Price High School, and
Fulton High School
Atlanta

BARBARA KING
Lead Reading Teacher
Mount Zion Elementary School
Jonesboro

EARLINE LOUDERMILK
Third Grade Teacher
Hazel Grove School
Mount Airy

FRANCES McBRIDE
Fourth Grade Teacher
Alps Road Elementary School
Athens

MILTON S. McDONALD
Green Professor of Education and
Head, Education and Psychology
Department
Berry College
Mount Berry

C. H. MORSE
Professor of Education and
Head, Department of Elementary and
Early Childhood Education
Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley

GWENDOLYN MUNDY
Elementary Curriculum Director
Hall County School System
Gainesville

JOAN POLITE
Seventh Grade Teacher
Peeples Street Elementary School
Atlanta

LOUISE RADLOFF
Member, Gwinnett County
Board of Education
Norcross

H. TITUS SINGLETARY, JR.
Associate State Superintendent
of Schools
Office of Planning and Development
Atlanta

LEANNA WALTON
Principal
Palmyra Heights Elementary School
Albany

JOSEPH A. WILLIAMS
Dean, College of Education and
Professor of Education
University of Georgia
Athens

RICHARD YOUNG
Superintendent
Ware County Schools
Waycross